1507/1037

THE *LETTERS* OF JUNIUS.

VOL. 1.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN WHEBLE,

in Pater Noster Row.

MDCCXCII.

DEDICATION

TO THE

ENGLISH NATION.

I DEDICATE to You a collection of Letters, written by one of Yourſelves for the common benefit of us all. They would never have grown to this ſize without your continued encouragement and applauſe. To me they originally owe nothing but a healthy, ſanguine conſtitution. Under *Your* care they have thriven. To *You* they are indebted for whatever ſtrength or beauty they poſſeſs. When Kings and Miniſters are forgotten, when the force and direction of perſonal ſatire is no longer underſtood, and when meaſures are only felt in their remoteſt conſequences, this book will, I believe, be found to contain principles worthy to be tranſmitted to poſterity. When you leave the unimpaired, hereditary freehold to Your children, You do but half Your duty. Both liberty and property are precarious, unleſs the poſſeſſors have ſenſe and ſpirit enough to defend them.—This is not the language of vanity. If I am a vain man, my gratification lies within a narrow circle. I am the ſole depoſitary of my own ſecret, and it ſhall periſh with me.

If an honeſt, and, I may truly affirm, a laborious

borious zeal for the public ſervice, has given me any weight in Your eſteem, let me exhort and conjure You never to ſuffer an invaſion of Your political conſtitution, however minute the inſtance may appear, to paſs by, without a determined, perſevering reſiſtance. One precedent creates another.—They ſoon accumulate, and conſtitute law. What yeſterday was fact, to-day is doctrine. Examples are ſuppoſed to juſtify the moſt dangerous meaſures; and where they do not ſuit exactly, the defect is ſupplied by analogy.—Be aſſured that the laws, which protect us in our civil rights, grow out of the conſtitution, and they muſt fall or flouriſh with it. This is not the cauſe of faction or of party, or of any individual, but the common intereſt of every man in Britain. Although the King ſhould continue to ſupport his preſent ſyſtem of government, the period is not very diſtant at which you will have the means of redreſs in your own power. It may be nearer perhaps than any of us expect, and I would warn You to be prepared for it. The King may poſſibly be adviſed to diſſolve the preſent parliament a year or two before it expires of courſe, and precipitate a new election, in hopes of taking the nation by ſurpriſe. If ſuch a meaſure be in agitation, this very caution may defeat or prevent it.

I cannot doubt that You will unanimouſly aſſert the freedom of election, and vindicate your excluſive right to chooſe your repreſentatives. But other queſtions have been ſtarted, on which your determination ſhould be equally clear and unanimous. Let it be impreſſed upon your minds,

let

let it be inſtilled into your children, that the liberty of the preſs is the *Palladium* of all the civil, political, and religious rights of an Engliſhman; and that the right of juries to return a general verdict, in all caſes whatſoever, is an eſſential part of our conſtitution, not to be controuled or limited by the judges, nor in any ſhape queſtionable by the legiſlature. The power of King, Lords, and Commons, is not an arbitrary power *. They are the truſtees, not the owners, of the eſtate. The fee-ſimple is in US. They cannot alienate, they cannot waſte. When we ſay that the legiſlature is *ſupreme*, we mean, that it is the higheſt power known to the conſtitution;—that it is the higheſt in com-

* This poſitive denial, of an arbitrary power being veſted in the legiſlature, is not in fact a new doctrine. When the Earl of Lindſay, in the year 1675, brought a bill into the Houſe of Lords, *To prevent the dangers which might ariſe from perſons diſaffected to government*, by which an oath and penalty was to be impoſed upon the members of both houſes, it was affirmed, in a proteſt ſigned by twenty-three lay peers, (my lords the biſhops were not accuſtomed to proteſt), "That the privilege of ſitting and "voting in parliament was an honour they had by "birth, and a right ſo inherent in them, and inſe-"parable from them, *that nothing could take it away* "but what, by the law of the land, muſt withal "take away their lives, and corrupt their blood."—Theſe noble peers (whoſe names are a reproach to their poſterity) have, in this inſtance, ſolemnly denied the power of parliament to alter the conſtitution. Under a particular propoſition, they have aſſerted a general truth, in which every man in England is concerned.

pariſon with the other ſubordinate powers eſtabliſhed by the laws. In this ſenſe, the word *ſupreme* is relative, not abſolute. The power of the legiſlature is limited, not only by the general rules of natural juſtice, and the welfare of the community, but by the forms and principles of our particular conſtitution. If this doctrine be not true, we muſt admit, that King, Lords, and Commons, have no rule to direct their reſolutions, but merely their own will and pleaſure. They might unite the legiſlative and executive power in the ſame hands, and diſſolve the conſtitution by an act of parliament. But I am perſuaded You will not leave it to the choice of ſeven hundred perſons, notoriouſly corrupted by the Crown, whether ſeven millions of their equals ſhall be freemen or ſlaves. The certainty of forfeiting their own rights, when they ſacrifice thoſe of the nation, is no check to a brutal, degenerate mind. Without inſiſting upon the extravagant conceſſion made to Harry the Eighth, there are inſtances, in the hiſtory of other countries, of a formal, deliberate ſurrender of the public liberty into the hands of the Sovereign. If England does not ſhare the ſame fate, it is becauſe we have better reſources than in the virtue of either houſe of parliament.

I ſaid that the liberty of the preſs is the *palladium* of all your rights, and that the right of the juries to return a general verdict is part of your conſtitution. To preſerve the whole ſyſtem, you muſt correct your legiſlature. With regard to any influence of the conſtituent over the conduct of the repreſentative, there is little difference between a ſeat

ſeat in parliament for ſeven years and a ſeat for life. The proſpect of your reſentment is too remote; and although the laſt ſeſſion of a ſeptennial parliament be uſually emyloyed in courting the favour of the people, conſider, that at this rate your repreſentatives have ſix years for offence, and but one for atonement. A death-bed repentance ſeldom reaches to reſtitution. If you reflect, that in the changes of adminiſtration which have marked and diſgraced the preſent reign, although your warmeſt patriots have in their turn been inveſted with the lawful and unlawful authority of the crown, and though other reliefs or improvements have been held forth to the people, yet that no one man in office has ever promoted or encouraged a bill for ſhortening the duration of parliaments, but that (whoever was miniſter) the oppoſition to this meaſure, ever ſince the ſeptennial act paſſed, has been conſtant and uniform on the part of government—You cannot but conclude, without the poſſibility of a doubt, that long parliaments are the foundation of the undue influence of the crown. This influence anſwers every purpoſe of arbitrary power to the crown, with an expence and oppreſſion to the people, which would be unneceſſary in an arbitrary government. The beſt of our miniſters find it the eaſieſt and moſt compendious mode of conducting the King's affairs; and all miniſters have a general intereſt in adhering to a ſyſtem, which of itſelf is ſufficient to ſupport them in office, without any aſſiſtance from perſonal virtue, popularity, labour, abilities, or experience. It promiſes every gratification to avarice and ambition, and ſecures impunity.——Theſe are truths

unqueſtionable.—If they make no impreſſion, it is becauſe they are too vulgar and notorious. But the inattention or indifference of the nation has continued too long. You are rouſed at laſt to a ſenſe of your danger.—The remedy will ſoon be in your power. If *Junius* lives, You ſhall often be reminded of it. If, when the opportunity preſents itſelf, you neglect to do your duty to yourſelves and to poſterity,—to God and to your country, I ſhall have one conſolation left, in common with the meaneſt and baſeſt of mankind:—Civil liberty may ſtill laſt the life of

JUNIUS.

LETTERS.

LETTER I.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *January* 21, 1769.

THE ſubmiſſion of a free people to the executive authority of government, is no more than a compliance with laws, which they themſelves have enacted. While the national honour is firmly maintained abroad, and while juſtice is impartially adminiſtered at home, the obedience of the ſubject will be voluntary, chearful, and I might almoſt ſay unlimited. A generous nation is grateful even for the preſervation of its rights, and willingly extends the reſpect due to the office of a good prince into an affection for his perſon. Loyalty, in the heart and underſtanding of an Engliſhman, is a rational attachment to the guardian of the laws. Prejudices and paſſion have ſometimes carried it to a criminal length; and, whatever foreigners may imagine, we know that Engliſhmen have erred as much in a miſtaken zeal for particular perſons and families, as they ever did in defence of what they thought moſt dear and intereſting to themſelves.

It naturally fills us with reſentment, to ſee ſuch a temper inſulted and abuſed. In reading the hiſtory

of a free people, whoſe rights have been invaded, we are intereſted in their cauſe. Our own feelings tell us how long they ought to have ſubmitted, and at what moment it would have been treachery to themſelves not to have reſiſted. How much warmer will be our reſentment, if experience ſhould bring the fatal example home to ourſelves!

The ſituation of this country is alarming enough to rouze the attention of every man, who pretends to a concern for the public welfare. Appearances juſtify ſuſpicion, and, when the ſafety of a nation is at ſtake ſuſpicion is a juſt ground of enquiry. Let us enter into it with candour and decency. Reſpect is due to the ſtation of miniſters; and, if a reſolution muſt at laſt be taken, there is none ſo likely to be ſupported with firmneſs, as that which has been adopted with moderation.

The ruin or proſperity of a ſtate depends ſo much upon the adminiſtration of its government, that to be acquainted with the merit of a miniſtry, we need only obſerve the condition of the people. If we ſee them obedient to the laws, proſperous in their induſtry, united at home, and reſpected abroad, we may reaſonably preſume that their affairs are conducted by men of experience, abilities and virtue. If, on the contrary, we ſee an univerſal ſpirit of diſtruſt and diſſatisfaction, a rapid decay of trade, diſſenſions in all parts of the empire, and a total loſs of reſpect in the eyes of foreign powers, we may pronounce, without heſitation, that the government of that country is weak, diſtracted, and corrupt. The multitude, in all countries, are patient to a certain point. Ill uſage may rouſe their indignation, and hurry them into exceſſes, but the orignial fault

is

is in government. Perhaps there never was an inſtance of a change, in the circumſtances and temper of a whole nation, ſo ſudden and extraordinary as that which the miſconduct of miniſters has, within theſe very few years, produced in Great Britain. When our gracious Sovereign aſcended the throne, we were a flouriſhing and contented people. If the perſonal virtues of a king could have inſured the happineſs of his ſubjects, the ſcene could not have altered ſo entirely as it has done. The idea of uniting all parties, of trying all characters, and diſtributing the offices of ſtate by rotation, was gracious and benevolent to an extreme, though it has not yet produced the many ſalutary effects which were intended by it. To ſay nothing of the wiſdom of ſuch a plan, it undoubtedly aroſe from an unbounded goodneſs of heart, in which folly had no ſhare. It was not a capricious partiality to new faces;—it was not a natural turn for low intrigue; nor was it the treacherous amuſement of double and triple negociations. No, Sir, it aroſe from a continued anxiety in the pureſt of all poſſible hearts, for the general welfare. Unfortunately for us, the event has not been anſwerable to the deſign. After a rapid ſucceſſion of changes, we are reduced to that ſtate, which hardly any change can mend. Yet there is no extremity of diſtreſs, which of itſelf ought to reduce a great nation to deſpair. It is not the diſorder but the phyſician;—it is not a caſual concurrence of calamitous circumſtances, it is the pernicious hand of government, which alone can make a whole people deſperate.

Without much political ſagacity, or any extraordinary depth of obſervation, we need only mark how

the principal departments of the ſtate are beſtowed, and look no farther for the true cauſe of every miſchief that befals us.

The finances of a nation, ſinking under its debts and expences, are committed to * a young nobleman already ruined by play. Introduced to act under the auſpices of Lord Chatham, and left at the head of affairs by that nobleman's retreat, he became miniſter by accident; but deſerting the priciples and profeſſions, which gave him a moment's popularity, we ſee him, from every honourable engagement to the public, an apoſtate by deſign. As for buſineſs the world yet knows nothing of his talents or reſolution, unleſs a wayward, wavering inconſiſtency be a mark of genius, and caprice a demonſtration of ſpirit. It may be ſaid, perhaps, that it is his grace's province, as ſurely it is his paſſion, rather to diſtribute than to ſave the public money, and that while lord North is Chancellor of the Exchecquer, the Firſt Lord of the Treaſury may be as thoughtleſs and as extravagant as he pleaſes. I hope however he will not rely too much on the fertility of Lord North's genius for finance. His lordſhip is yet to give us the firſt proof of his abilities; it may be candid to ſuppoſe that he has hitherto voluntarily concealed his talents, intending perhaps to aſtoniſh the world when we leaſt expect it, with a knowledge of trade, a choice of expedients, and a depth of reſcources, equal to the neceſſities, and far beyond the hopes of his country. He muſt now exert the whole power of his capacity, if he would wiſh us to forget, that, ſince he has been in office, no plan has been formed, no ſyſtem adhered to, nor any one important meaſure adopted for the relief

* The Duke of Graſton.

relief of public credit. If his plan for the ſervice of the current year be not irrevocably fixed on, let me warn him to think ſeriouſly of conſequences, before he ventures to increaſe the public debt. Outraged and oppreſſed as we are, this nation will not bear, after a ſix years peace, to ſee new millions borrowed, without any eventual diminution of debt, or reduction of intereſt. The attempt might rouze a ſpirit of reſentment, which might reach beyond the ſacrifice of a miniſter. As to the debt upon the Civil Liſt, the people of England expect that it will not be paid without a ſtrict enquiry how it was incurred. If it muſt be paid by parliament, let me adviſe the Chancellor of the Exchequer to think of ſome better expedient than a lottery. To ſupport an expenſive war, or in circumſtances of abſolute neceſſity, a lottery may perhaps be allowable; but, beſides that is at all times the very worſt way of raiſing money upon the people, I think it ill becomes the royal dignity, to have the debts of a court provided for, like the repairs of a country bridge, or a decayed hoſpital. The management of the king's affairs in the Houſe of Commons cannot be more diſgraced than it has been. A leading miniſter repeatedly called down for abſolute ignorance,—ridiculous motions ridiculouſly withdrawn,—deliberate plans diſconcerted, and a week's preparation of graceful oratory loſt in a moment, give us ſome, though not adequate ideas of lord North's parliamentary abilities and influence. Yet before he had the misfortune of being Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was neither an object of deriſion to his enemies, nor of melancholy pity to his friends.

A ſeries of inconſiſtent meaſures had alienated the Colonies from their duty as ſubjects, and from their natural affection to their common country. When

Mr. Grenville was placed at the head of the Treaſury, he felt the impoſſibility of Great Britain's ſupporting ſuch an eſtabliſhment as her former ſucceſſes had made indiſputable, and at the ſame time of giving any ſenſible relief to foreign trade, and to the weight of the public debt. He thought it equitable that thoſe parts of the empire, which had benefited moſt by the expences of the war, ſhould contribute ſomething to the expences of the peace, and he had no doubt of the conſtitutional right veſted in parliament to raiſe the contribution. But, unfortunately for this country, Mr. Grenville was at any rate to be diſtreſſed becauſe he was miniſter, and Mr. Pitt and lord Camden were to be patrons of America, becauſe they were in oppoſition. Their declaration gave ſpirit and argument to the Colonies, and while perhaps they meant no more than the ruin of a miniſter, they in effect divided one half of the empire from the other.

Under one adminiſtration the ſtamp act is made, under the ſecond it is repealed, under the third, in ſpite of all experience, a new mode of taxing the Colonies is invented, and a queſtion revived, which ought to have been buried in oblivion. In theſe circumſtances a new office is eſtabliſhed for the buſineſs of the Plantations, and the earl of Hillſborough called forth, at a moſt critical ſeaſon, to govern America. The choice at leaſt announced to us a man of ſuperior capacity and knowledge. Whether he be ſo or not let his diſpatches as far as they have appeared, let his meaſures, as far as they have operated, determine for him. In the former we have ſeen ſtrong aſſertions without proof, declamation without argument, and violent cenſures without dignity or moderation: but neither correctneſs in the compoſition, nor judgement

in

in the deſign. As for his meaſures, let it be remembered, that he was called upon to conciliate and unite; and that, when he entered into office, the moſt refractory of the Colonies were ſtill diſpoſed to proceed by the conſtitutional methods of petition and remonſtrance. Since that period they have been driven into exceſſes little ſhort of rebellion. Petitions have been hindered from reaching the throne; and the continuance of one of the principal aſſemblies put upon an arbitrary condition, which, conſidering the temper they were in, it was impoſſible they ſhould comply with, and which would have availed nothing as to the general queſtion, if it had been complied with. So violent, and I believe I may call it ſo unconſtitutional an exertion of the prerogative, to ſay nothing of the weak, injudicious terms in which it was conveyed, gives us as humble an opinion of his lordſhip's capacity, as it does of his temper and moderation. While we are at peace with other nations, our military force may perhaps be ſpared to ſupport the earl of Hillſborough's meaſures in America. Whenever that force ſhall be neceſſarily withdrawn or diminiſhed, the diſmiſſion of ſuch a miniſter will neither conſole us for his imprudence, nor remove the ſettled reſentment of a people, who, complaining of an act of the legiſlature, are outraged by an unwarrantable ſtretch of prerogative, and, ſupporting their claims by an argument, are inſulted with declamation.

Drawing lots would be a prudent and reaſonable method of appointing the officers of ſtate, compared to a late diſpoſition of the Secretary's office. Lord Rochford was acquainted with the affairs and temper of the ſouthern courts: Lord Weymouth was equally qualified for either department. By what unaccount-

able

able caprice has it happened, that the latter, who pretends to no experience whatſoever, is removed to the moſt important of the two departments, and the former by preference placed in an office, where his experience can be of no uſe to him? Lord Weymouth had diſtinguiſhed himſelf in his firſt employment by a ſpirited, if not judicious conduct. He had animated the civil magiſtrate beyond the tone of civil authority, and had directed the operations of the army to more than military execution. Recovered from the errors of his youth, from the diſtraction of play, and the bewitching ſmiles of Burgundy, behold him exerting the whole ſtrength of his clear, unclouded faculties, in the ſervice of the crown. It was not the heat of midnight exceſſes, nor ignorance of the laws, nor the furious ſpirit of the houſe of Bedford: No, Sir, when this reſpectable miniſter interpoſed his authority between the magiſtrate and the people, and ſigned the mandate, on which, for aught he knew, the lives of thouſands depended, he did it from the deliberate motion of his heart, ſupported from the beſt of his judgment.

It has lately been a faſhion to pay a compliment to the bravery and generoſity of the Commander in Chief, at the expence of his underſtanding. They who love him make no queſtion of his courage, while his friends dwell chiefly on the facility of his diſpoſition. Admitting him to be as brave as a total abſence of all feeling and reflection can make him, let us ſee what ſort of merit he derives from the remainder of his character. If it be generoſity to accumulate in his own perſon and family a number of lucrative employments; to provide, at the public expence, for every creature that bears the name of *Manners*; and, neglecting

neglecting the merit and ſervices of the reſt of the army, to heap promotions upon his favourites and dependants, the preſent Commander in Chief is the moſt generous man alive. Nature has been ſparing of her gifts to this noble lord; but where birth and fortune are united, we expect the noble pride and independance of a man of ſpirit, not the ſervile, humiliating complhiſance of a courtier. As to the goodneſs of his heart, if a proof of it be taken from the facility of never refuſing, what concluſion ſhall we draw from the indecency of never performing? and if the diſcipline of the army be in any degree preſerved, what thanks are due to a man, whoſe cares, notoriouſly confined to filling up vacancies, have degraded the office of Commander and Chief into a broker of commiſſions?

With reſpect to the navy, I ſhall only ſay, that this country is ſo highly indebted to Sir Edward Hawke, that no expence ſhould be ſpared to ſecure him an honourable and affluent retreat.

The pure and impartial adminiſtration of juſtice is perhaps the firmeſt bond to ſecure a chearful ſubmiſſion of the people, and to engage their affections to government. It is not ſufficient that queſtions of private right and wrong are juſtly decided, nor that judges are ſuperior to the vileneſs of pecuniary corruption. Jefferies himſelf, when the court had no intereſt, was an upright judge. A court of juſtice may be ſubject to another ſort of bias, more important and pernicious, as it reaches beyond the intereſt of individuals, and affects the whole community. A judge, under the influence of government, may be honeſt enough in the deciſion of private cauſes, yet a traitor to the public. When a victim is marked out

by

by the miniſtry, this judge will offer himſelf to perform the ſacrifice. He will not ſcruple to proſtitute his dignity, and betray the ſanctity of his office, whenever an arbitrary point is to be carried for government, or the reſentment of a court to be gratified.

Theſe principles and proceedings, odious and contemptible as they are, in effect are no leſs injudicious. A wiſe and generous people are rouſed by every appearance of oppreſſive, unconſtitutional meaſures, whether thoſe meaſures are ſupported openly by the power of government, or maſked under the forms of a court of juſtice. Prudence and ſelf-preſervation will oblige the moſt moderate diſpoſitions to make a common cauſe, even with a man whoſe conduct they cenſure, if they ſee him perſecuted in a way which the real ſpirit of the laws will not juſtify. The facts on which theſe remarks are founded, are too notorious to require an application.

This, Sir, is the detail. In one view behold a nation overwhelmed with debt; her revenues waſted; her trade declining; the affections of her Colonies alienated; the duty of the magiſtrate transferred to the ſoldiery; a gallant army, which never fought unwillingly but againſt their fellow-ſubjects, mouldering away for want of the direction of a man of common abilities and ſpirit; and, in the laſt inſtance, the adminiſtration of juſtice become odious and ſuſpected to the whole body of the people. This deplorable ſcene admits but of one addition—that we are governed by counſels, from which a reaſonable man can expect no remedy but poiſon, no relief but death.

If, by the immediate interpoſition of Providence, it were poſſible for us to eſcape a criſis ſo full of

terror

terror and deſpair, poſterity will not believe the hiſtory of the preſent times. They will either conclude that our diſtreſſes were imaginary, or that we had the good fortune to be governed by men of acknowledged integrity and wiſdom: they will not believe it poſſible that their anceſtors could have ſurvived, or recovered from ſo deſperate a condition, while a duke of Grafton was Prime Miniſter, a lord North Chancellor of the Exchequer, a Weymouth and a Hillſborough Secretaries of State, a Granby Commander in Chief, and a Mansfield Chief Criminal Judge of the kingdom.

JUNIUS.

LETTER II.

A LETTER OF SIR WILLIAM DRAPER TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *January* 26, 1769.

THE kingdom ſwarms with ſuch numbers of felonious robbers of private character and virtue, that no honeſt or good man is ſafe; eſpecially as theſe cowardly baſe aſſaſſins ſtab in the dark, without having the courage to ſign their real names to their malevolent and wicked productions. A writer, who ſigns himſelf Junius, in the Public Advertiſer of the 21ſt inſtant, opens the deplorable ſituation of his country in a very affecting manner; with a pompous parade of his candour and decency, he tells us, that we ſee diſſentions in all parts of the empire, an univerſal ſpirit of diſtruſt and diſſatisfaction, and a total

loſs

loſs of reſpect towards us in the eyes of foreign powers. But this writer, with all his boaſted candour, has not told us the real cauſe of the evils he ſo pathetically enumerates. I ſhall take the liberty to explain the cauſe for him. Junius, and ſuch writers as himſelf, occaſion all the miſchief complained of, by falſely and maliciouſly traducing the beſt characters in the kingdom. For when our deluded people at home, and foreigners abroad, read the poiſonous and inflammatory libels that are daily publiſhed with impunity, to villify thoſe who are any way diſtintinguiſhed by their good qualities and eminent virtues: when they find no notice taken of, or reply given to theſe ſlanderous tongues and pens, their concluſion is, that both the miniſter and the nation have been fairly deſcribed; and they act accordingly. I think it therefore the duty of every good citizen to ſtand forth, and endeavour to undeceive the public, when the vileſt arts are made uſe of to deſame and blacken the brighteſt characters amongſt us. An eminent author affirms it to be almoſt as criminal to hear a worthy man traduced, without attempting his juſtification, as to be the author of the calumny againſt him. For my own part, I think it is a ſort of miſpriſion of treaſon againſt ſociety. No man therefore who knows lord Granby, can poſſibly hear ſo good and great a character moſt vilely abuſed, without a warm and juſt indignation againſt this Junius, this high prieſt of Envy, Malice, and all uncharitableneſs, who has endeavoured to ſacrifice our beloved Commander in Chief at the altars of his horrid deities. Nor is the injury done to his lordſhip alone, but to the whole nation, which may too ſoon feel the contempt, and conſequently the attacks of

our

our late enemies, if they can be induced to believe that the perſon, on whom the ſafety of theſe kingdoms ſo much depends, is unequal to his high ſtation, and deſtitute of thoſe qualities which form a good general. One would have thought that his lordſhip's ſervices in the cauſe of his country, from the battle of Culloden to his moſt glorious concluſion of the late war, might have entitled him to common reſpect and decency at leaſt; but this uncandid indecent writer, has gone ſo far as to turn one of the moſt amiable men of the age into a ſtupid, unfeeling, and ſenſeleſs being, poſſeſſed indeed of perſonal courage, but void of thoſe eſſential qualities which diſtinguiſh the commander from the common ſoldier.

A very long, uninterrupted, impartial, I will add, a moſt diſintereſted friendſhip with lord Granby gives me the right to affirm, that all Junius's aſſertions are falſe and ſcandalous. Lord Granby's courage, though of the brighteſt and moſt ardent kind, is among the loweſt of his numerous good qualities: he was formed to excel in war by Nature's liberality to his mind as well as perſon. Educated and inſtructed by his moſt noble father, and a moſt ſpirited as well as excellent ſcholar, the preſent biſhop of Bangor, he was trained to the niceſt ſenſe of honour, and to the trueſt and nobleſt ſort of pride, that of never doing or ſuffering a mean action. A ſincere love and attachment to his king and country, and to their glory, firſt impelled him to the field, where he never gained aught but honour. He impaired, through his bounty, his own fortune; for his bounty, which this writer would in vain depreciate, is founded upon the nobleſt of the human affections, it flows from a heart melting to goodneſs from the moſt

refined humanity. Can a man, who is described as unfeeling, and void of reflection, be constantly employed in seeking proper objects on whom to exercise those glorious virtues of compassion and generosity? The distressed officer, the soldier, the widow, the orphan, and a long list besides, know that vanity has no share in his frequent donations; he gives, because he feels their distresses. Nor has he ever been rapacious with one hand to be bountiful with the other; yet this uncandid Junius, would insinuate that the dignity of the Commander in Chief is depraved into the base office of a commission broker; that is, lord Granby bargains for the sale of commissions; for it must have this meaning, if it has any at all. But where is the man living who can justly charge his lordship with such mean practices? Why does not Junius produce him? Junius knows that he has no other means of wounding this hero, than from some missile weapon, shot from an obscure corner: He seeks, as all such defamatory writers do,

——spargere voces
In Vulgum ambiguas——

to raise suspicion in the minds of the people. But I hope that my countrymen will be no longer imposed upon by artful and designing men, or by wretches, who, bankrupts in business, in fame, and in fortune, mean nothing more than to involve this country in the same common ruin with themselves. Hence it is, that they are constantly aiming their dark and too often fatal weapons against those who stand forth as the bulwarks of our national safety. Lord Granby was too conspicuous a mark not to be

their

their object. He is next attacked for being unfaithful to his promiſes and engagements: Where are Junius's proofs? Although I could give ſome inſtances, where a breach of promiſe would be virtue, eſpecially in the caſe of thoſe who will pervert the open unſuſpecting moments of convivial mirth, into ſly, inſidious applications for preferment, or party ſyſtems, and would endeavour to ſurpriſe a good man, who cannot bear to ſee any one leave him diſſatisfied, into unguarded promiſes. Lord Granby's attention to his own family and relations is called ſelfiſh. Had he not attended to them, when fair and juſt opportunities preſented themſelves, I ſhould have thought him unfeeling, and void of reflection indeed. How are any man's friends or relations to be provided for, but from the influence and protection of the patron? It is unfair to ſuppoſe that lord Granby's friends have not as much merit as the friends of any other great man: If he is generous at the public expence, as Junius invidiouſly calls it, the public is at no more expence for his lordſhip's friends, than it would be if any other ſet of men poſſeſſed thoſe offices. The charge is ridiculous!

The laſt charge againſt lord Granby is of a moſt ſerious and alarming nature indeed. Junius aſſerts, that the army is mouldering away for want of the direction of a man of common abilities and ſpirit. The preſent condition of the army gives the directeſt lie to his aſſertions. It was never upon a more reſpectable footing with regard to diſcipline, and all the eſſentials that can form good ſoldiers. Lord Ligonier delivered a firm and noble palladium of our ſafeties into lord Granby's hands, who has kept it in the ſame good order in which he received it. The

ſtricteſt care has been taken to fill up the vacant commiſſions, with ſuch gentlemen as have the glory of their anceſtors to ſupport, as well as their own, and are doubly bound to the cauſe of their king and country, from motives of private property, as well as public ſpirit. The Adjutant-general, who has the immediate care of the troops after lord Granby, is an officer who would do great honour to any ſervice in Europe, for his correct arrangements, good ſenſe and diſcernment upon all occaſions, and for a punctuality and preciſion which give the moſt entire ſatisfaction to all who are obliged to conſult him. The Reviewing-generals, who inſpect the army twice a year, have been ſelected with the greateſt care, and have anſwered the important truſt repoſed in them in the moſt laudable manner. Their reports of the condition of the army are much more to be credited than thoſe of Junius, whom I do adviſe, to atone, for his ſhameful aſperſions, by aſking pardon of lord Granby and the whole kingdom, whom he has offended by his abominable ſcandals. In ſhort, to turn Junius's own battery againſt him, I muſt aſſert, in his own words, "That he has given ſtrong aſſertions without proof, declamation without argument, and violent cenſures without dignity or moderation.

WILLIAM DRAPER.

LETTER III.

TO SIR WILLIAM DRAPER, KNIGHT OF THE BATH.

SIR, *February* 7, 1769.

YOUR defence of lord Granby does honour to the goodneſs of your heart. You feel, as you ought to do, for the reputation of your friend, and you expreſs yourſelf in the warmeſt language of the paſſions. In any other cauſe, I doubt not, you would have cautiouſly weighed the conſequences of committing your name to the licentious diſcourſes and malignant opinions of the world. But here, I preſume, you thought it would be a breach of friendſhip to loſe one moment in conſulting your underſtanding; as if an appeal to the public were no more than a military *coup de main*, where a brave man has no rule to follow, but the dictates of his courage. Touched with your generoſity, I freely forgive the exceſſes into which it has led you; and, far from reſenting thoſe terms of reproach, which, conſidering that you are an advocate for decorum, you have heaped upon me rather too liberally, I place them to the account of an honeſt unreflecting indignation, in which your cooler judgment and natural politeneſs had no concern. I approve of the ſpirit, with which you have given your name to the public; and if it were a proof of any thing but ſpirit, I ſhould have thought myſelf bound to follow your example. I ſhould have hoped that even *my* name might carry ſome authority with it, if I had not ſeen how very little weight or conſideration a printed paper receives even from the reſpectable ſignature of Sir William Draper.

You begin with a general aſſertion, that writers ſuch as I am, are the real cauſe of all the public evils we complain of. And do you really think, Sir William, that the licentious pen of a political writer is able to produce ſuch important effects? A little calm reflection might have ſhewn you, that national calamities do not riſe from the deſcription, but from the real character and conduct of miniſters. To have ſupported your aſſertion, you ſhould have proved that the preſent miniſtry are unqueſtionably the *beſt and brighteſt* characters of the kingdom; and that if the affections of the Colonies had been alienated, if Corſica has been ſhamefully abandoned, if commerce languiſhes, if public credit is threatened with a new debt, and your own Manilla Ranſom moſt diſhonourably given up, it has all being owing to the malice of political writers, who will not ſuffer the beſt and brighteſt characters (meaning ſtill the preſent miniſtry) to take a ſingle right ſtep for the honour or intereſt of the nation. But it ſeems you were a little tender of coming to particulars. Your conſcience inſinuated to you, that it would be prudent to leave the characters of Grafton, North, Hillſborough, Weymouth, and Mansfield, to ſhift for themſelves; and truly, Sir William, the part you *have* undertaken is at leaſt as much as you are equal to.

Without diſputing lord Granby's courage, we are yet to learn in what articles of military knowledge Nature has been ſo very liberal to his mind. If you have ſerved with him, you ought to have pointed out ſome inſtances of able diſpoſition and well concerted enterprize, which might fairly be attributed to his capacity as a general. It is you Sir William, who

make

make your friend appear aukward and ridiculous, by giving him a laced ſuit of tawdry qualifications which Nature never intended him to wear.

You ſay he has acquired nothing but honour in the field. Is the Ordnance nothing? Are the Blues nothing? Is the command of the army, with all the patronage annexed to it, nothing? Where he got theſe *nothings* I know not; but you at leaſt ought to have told us where he deſerved them.

As to his bounty, compaſſion, &c. it would have been but little to the purpoſe, though you had proved all that you have aſſerted. I meddle with nothing but his character as Commander in Chief; and though I acquit him of the baſeneſs of ſelling commiſſions, I ſtill aſſert that his military cares have never extended beyond the diſpoſal of vacancies; and I am juſtified by the complaints of the whole army, when I ſay that, in this diſtribution, he conſults nothing but parliamentary intereſts, or the gratification of his immediate dependants. As to his ſervile ſubmiſſion to the reigning miniſtry, let me aſk, whether he did not deſert the cauſe of the whole army, when he ſuffered Sir Jeffery Amherſt to be ſacrificed, and what ſhare he had in recalling that officer to the ſervice. Did he not betray the juſt intereſt of the army, in permitting lord Percy to have a regiment? and does he not this moment give up all character and dignity as a gentleman, in receding from his own repeated declarations in favour of Mr. Wilkes.

In the two next articles I think we are agreed. You candidly admit, that he often makes ſuch promiſes as it is a virtue in him to violate, and that no man is more aſſiduous to provide for his relations at the public expence. I did not urge the laſt as an abſolute

abſolute vice in his diſpoſition, but to prove that a *careleſs diſintereſted ſpirit* is no part of his character; and as to the other, I deſire it may be remembered, that *I* never deſcended to the indecency of inquiring into his *convivial hours*. It is you, Sir William Draper, who have taken pains to preſent your friend in the character of a drunken landlord, who deals out his promiſes as liberally as his liquor, and will ſuffer no man to leave his table either ſorrowful or ſober. None but an intimate friend, who muſt frequently have ſeen him in theſe unhappy, diſgraceful moments, could have deſcribed him ſo well.

The laſt charge, of the neglect of the army, is indeed the moſt material of all. I am ſorry to tell you, Sir William, that, in this article, your firſt fact is falſe, and as there is nothing more painful to me than to give a direct contradiction to a gentleman of your appearance, I could wiſh that, in your future publications, you would pay a greater attention to the truth of your premiſes, before you ſuffer your genius to hurry you to a concluſion. Lord Ligonier *did not* deliver the army (which you, in claſſical language, are pleaſed to call a palladium) into lord Granby's hands. It was taken from him, much againſt hi inclination, ſome two or three years before lord Granby was Commander in Chief. As to the ſtate of the Army, I ſhould be glad to know where you have received your intelligence. Was it in the rooms at Bath, or at your retreat at Clifton? The reports of Reviewing-Generals comprehend only a few regiments in England, which, as they are immediately under the royal inſpection, are perhaps in ſome tolerable order. But do you know any thing of the troops in the Weſt-Indies, the Mediterranean, and

and North America, to ſay nothing of a whole army abſolutely ruined in Ireland? Inquire a little into facts, Sir William, before you publiſh your next panegyric upon lord Granby, and believe me you will find there is a fault at head quarters, which even the acknowledged care and abilities of the Adjutant-general cannot correct.

Permit me now, Sir William, to addreſs myſelf perſonally to you, by way of thanks for the honour of your correſpondence. You are by no means undeſerving of notice; and it may be of conſequence even to lord Granby to have it determined, whether or no the man, who has praiſed him ſo laviſhly, be himſelf deſerving of praiſe. When you returned to Europe, you zealouſly undertook the cauſe of that gallant army, by whoſe bravery at Manilla your own fortunes had been eſtabliſhed. You complained, you threatened, you even appealed to the public in print. By what accident did it happen, that in the midſt of all this buſtle, and all theſe clamours for juſtice to your injured troops, the name of the Manilla Ranſom was ſuddenly buried in a profound, and ſince that time, an uninterrupted ſilence? Did the miniſtry ſuggeſt any motives to you, ſtrong enough to tempt a man of honour to deſert and betray the cauſe of his fellow-ſoldiers? Was it that bluſhing ribband, which is now the perpetual ornament of your perſon? or was it that regiment, which you afterwards (a thing unprecedented among ſoldiers) ſold to colonel Giſborne? or was it that government, the full pay of which you are contented to hold, with the half-pay of an Iriſh colonel? And do you now, after a retreat not very like that of Scipio, preſume to intrude yourſelf, unthought of, uncalled for, upon the

patience

patience of the public? Are your flatteries of the Commander in Chief directed to another regiment, which you may again diſpoſe of on the ſame honourable terms? we know your prudence, Sir William, and I ſhould be ſorry to ſtop your perferment.

JUNIUS.

LETTER IV.

A LETTER OF SIR WILLIAM DRAPER TO JUNIUS.

SIR, *February* 16, 1769.

I RECEIVED Junius's favour laſt night; he is determined to keep his advantage by the help of his maſk; it is an excellent protection, it has ſaved many a man from an untimely end. But whenever he will be honeſt enough to lay it aſide, avow himſelf, and produce the face which has ſo long lurked behind it, the world will be able to judge of his motives for writing ſuch infamous invectives. His real name will diſcover his freedom and independency, or his ſervility to a faction. Diſappointed ambition, reſentment for defeated hopes, and deſire of revenge, aſſume but too often the appearance of public ſpirit; but be his deſigns wicked or charitable, Junius ſhould learn that it is poſſible to condemn meaſures, without a barbarous and criminal outrage againſt men. Junius delights to mangle carcaſes with a hatchet; his language and inſtrument have a great connexion with Clare-market, and to do him juſtice, he handles his weapon moſt admirably. One would imagine he had been taught to throw it by the Savages of America. It is therefore high time for me

to

ſtep in once more to ſhield my friend from his mercileſs weapon, although I may be wounded in the attempt. But I muſt firſt aſk Junius, by what forced analogy and conſtruction, the moments of convivial mirth are made to ſignify indecency, a violation of engagements, a drunken landlord, and a deſire that every one in company ſhould be drunk likewiſe? He muſt have culled all the flowers of St. Giles's and Billinſgate, to have produced ſuch a piece of oratory. Here the hatchet deſcends with ten-fold vengeance; but alas! it hurts no one but its maſter! For Junius muſt not think to put words into my mouth, that ſeem too foul even for his own.

My friend's political engagements I know not, ſo cannot pretend to explain them, or aſſert their conſiſtency. I know not whether Junius be conſiderable enough to belong to any party; if he ſhould be ſo, can he affirm that he has always adhered to one ſet of men and meaſures? Is he ſure that he never ſided with thoſe whom he was firſt hired to abuſe? Has he never abuſed thoſe he was hired to praiſe? To ſay the truth, moſt men's politics ſit much too looſely about them. But as my friend's military character was the chief object that engaged me in this controverſy to that I ſhall return.

Junius aſks what inſtances my friend has given of his military ſkill and capacity as a general? When and where he gained his honour? When he deſerved his emoluments? The united voice of the army which ſerved under him, the glorious teſtimony of prince Ferdinand, and of vanquiſhed enemies, all Germany will tell him. Junius repeats the complaints of the army againſt parliamentary influence. I love the army too well, not to wiſh that ſuch influence were

leſs

leſs. Let Junius point out the time when it has not prevailed. It was of the leaſt force in the time of that great man, the late duke of Cumberland, who, as a Prince of the Blood, was able as well as willing to ſtem a torrent which would have overborne any private ſubject. In time of war this influence is ſmall. In peace, when diſcontent and faction have the ſureſt means to operate, eſpecially in this country, and when, from a ſcarcity of public ſpirit, the wheels of government are rarely moved, but by the power and force of obligations, its weight is always too great. Yet if this influence at preſent has done no greater harm than the placing earl Percy at the head of a regiment, I do not think that either the rights or beſt intereſts of the army are ſacrificed and betrayed; or the nation undone. Let me aſk Junius, if he knows any one nobleman in the army, who has had a regiment by ſeniority? I feel myſelf happy in ſeeing young noblemen of illuſtrious name and great property come among us. They are an additional ſecurity to the kingdom from foreign or domeſtic ſlavery. Junius needs not be told, that ſhould the time ever come, when this nation is to be defended only by thoſe, who have nothing more to loſe than their arms and their pay, its danger will be great indeed. A happy mixture of men of quality with ſoldiers of fortune, is always to wiſhed for. But the main point is ſtill to be contended for, I mean the diſcipline and condition of the army, and I ſtill muſt maintain, though contradicted by Junius, that it was never upon a more reſpectable footing, as to all the eſſentials that can form good ſoldiers, than it is at preſent. Junius is forced to allow that our army at home may be in ſome tolerable order; yet how kindly does he invite

invite our late enemies to the invaſion of Ireland, by aſſuring them that the army in that kingdom is totally ruined! (The colonels of that army are much obliged to him.) I have too great an opinion of the military talents of the Lord Lieutenant, and of their diligence and capacity, to believe it. If from ſome ſtrange, unaccountable fatality, the people of that kingdom cannot be induced to conſult their own ſecurity, by ſuch an effectual augmentation, as may enable the troops there to act with power and energy, is the Commander in Chief here to blame? Or is he to blame, becauſe the troops in the Mediterranean, in the Weſt-Indies, in America, labour under great difficulties from that ſcarcity of men, which is but too viſible all over theſe kingdoms! Many of our forces are in climates unfavourable to Britiſh conſtitutions, their loſs is in proportion. Britain muſt recruit all theſe regiments from her own emaciated boſom, or, more precarioufly, by Catholicks from Ireland. We are likewiſe ſubject to the fatal drains to the Eaſt Indies, to Senegal, and the alarming emigrations of our people to other countries: Such depopulation can only be repaired by a long peace, or by ſome ſenſible bill of naturalization.

I muſt now take the liberty to talk to Junius on my own account. He is pleaſed to tell me that he addreſſes himſelf to me *perſonally*. I ſhall be glad to ſee him. It is his *imperſonality* that I complain of, and his inviſible attacks; for his dagger in the air is only to be regarded, becauſe one cannot ſee the hand which holds it; but had it not wounded other people more deeply than myſelf, I ſhould not have obtruded myſelf at all on the patience of the public.

Mark how a plain tale ſhall put him down, and

transfuſe the bluſh of my ribband into his own cheeks. Junius tells me, that at my return, I zealouſly undertook the cauſe of the gallant army, by whoſe bravery at the Manilla my own fortunes were eſtabliſhed; that I complained, that I even appealed to the public in print. I did ſo; I glory in having done ſo, as I had an undoubted right to vindicate my own character, attacked by a Spaniſh memorial, and to aſſert the rights of my brave companions. I glory likewiſe, that I have never taken up my pen, but to vindicate the injured. Junius aſks by what accident did it happen, that in the midſt of all this buſtle, and all theſe clamours for juſtice to the injured troops, the Manilla ranſom was ſuddenly buried in a profound, and, ſince that time, an uninterrupted ſilence? I will explain the cauſe to the public. The ſeveral miniſters who have been employed ſince that time, have been very deſirous to do us juſtice from two moſt laudable motives, a ſtrong inclination to aſſiſt injured bravery, and to acquire a well deſerved popularity to themſelves. Their efforts have been in vain. Some were ingenuous enough to own, that they could not think of involving this diſtreſſed nation in another war for our private concerns. In ſhort, our rights for the preſent, are ſacrificed to national convenience; and I muſt confeſs, that although I may loſe five-and-twenty thouſand pounds by their acquieſcence to this breach of faith in the Spaniards, I think they are in the right to temporize, conſidering the critical ſituation of this country, convulſed in every part by poiſon infuſed by anonymous, wicked, and incendiary writers. Lord Shelburne will do me the juſtice to own, that in September laſt, I waited upon him with a joint

a joint memorial from the admiral Sir S. Corniſh and myſelf, in behalf of our injured companions. His lordſhip was as frank upon the occaſion as other Secretaries had been before him. He did not deceive us by giving any immediate hopes of relief.

Junius would baſely inſinuate, that my ſilence may have been purchaſed by my government, by my *bluſhing* ribband, by my regiment, by the ſale of that regiment, and by half-pay as an Iriſh colonel.

His Majeſty was pleaſed to give me my government, for my ſervices at Madras. I had my firſt regiment in 1757. Upon my return from Manilla, his Majeſty, by lord Egremont, informed me that I ſhould have the firſt vacant red ribband, as a reward for my ſervices in an enterprize, which I had planned as well as executed. The duke of Bedford and Mr. Grenville confirmed thoſe aſſurances many months before the Spaniards had proteſted the ranſom bills. To accommodate lord Clive, then going upon a moſt important ſervice to Bengal, I waved my claim to the vacancy which then happened. As there was no other vacancies until the duke of Grafton and lord Rockingham were joint miniſters, I was then honoured with the order, and it is ſurely no ſmall honour to me, that in ſuch a ſucceſſion of miniſters, they were all pleaſed to think that I had deſerved it; in my favour they were all united. Upon the reduction of the 79th regiment, which had ſerved ſo glorioufly in the Eaſt-Indies, his Majeſty, unſolicited by me, gave me the 16th of foot as an equivalent. My motives for retiring afterwards are foreign to the purpoſe; let it ſuffice, that his Majeſty was pleaſed to approve of them; they are ſuch as no man can think indecent, who knows the ſhocks that repeated viciſſi-

tudes of heat and cold, of dangerous and ſickly climates, will give the beſt conſtitutions in a pretty long courſe of ſervice. I reſigned my regiment to colonel Giſborne, a very good officer, for his half pay, and 1200l. * Iriſh annuity; ſo that according to Junius, I have been bribed to ſay nothing more of the Manilla ranſom, and ſacrifice thoſe brave men, by the ſtrange avarice of accepting three hundred and eighty pounds *per annum*, and giving up eight hundred! If this be bribery, it is not the bribery of theſe times! As to my flattery, thoſe who know me will judge of it. By the aſperity of Junius's ſtile I cannot indeed call him a flatterer, unleſs it be as a cynick or a maſtiff; if he wags his tail, he will ſtill growl, and long to bite. The public will now judge of the credit that ought to be given to Junius's writings, from the falſities that he has inſinuated with reſpect to myſelf.

WILLIAM DRAPER

LETTER V.

TO SIR WILLIAM DRAPER KNIGHT OF THE BATH.

SIR, *February*, 21, 1769.

I SHOULD juſtly be ſuſpected of acting upon motives of more than common enmity to lord Granby, if I continued to give you freſh materials or occaſion for writing in his defence. Individuals who hate

* This ſum ſhould be 200l. as afterwards corrected by Sir William Draper, in the Public Advertiſer of *February* 22, 1769.

hate, and the public who deſpiſe, have read *your* letters, Sir William, with infinitely more ſatisfaction than mine. Unfortunately for him, his reputation, like that unhappy country to which you refer me for his laſt military atchievments, has ſuffered more by his friends than his enemies. In mercy to him, let let us drop the ſubject. For my own part, I willingly leave it to the public to determine whether your vindication of your friend has been as able and judicious, as it was certainly well intended; and you I think may be ſatisfied with the warm acknowledgments he already owes you for making him the principal figure in a piece, in which, but for your amicable aſſiſtance, he might have paſſed without particular notice or diſtinction.

In juſtice to your friends, let your future labours be confined to the care of your own reputation. Your declaration, that you are happy in ſeeing young noblemen *come among us*, is liable to two objections. With reſpect to lord Percy, it means nothing, for he was already in the army. He was aid de camp to the king, and had the rank of colonel. A regiment therefore could not make him a more military man, though it made him richer, and probably at the expence of ſome brave, deſerving, friendleſs officer.—The other concerns yourſelf. After ſelling the companions of your victory in one inſtance, and after ſelling your profeſſion in the other, by what authority do you preſume to call yourſelf a ſoldier? The plain evidence of facts is ſuperior to all declarations. Before you were appointed to the 16th regiment, your complaints were a diſtreſs to government;—from that moment you were ſilent. The concluſion is inevitable. You inſinuate to us that your ill ſtate of

health obliged you to quit the ſervice. The retirement neceſſary to repair a broken conſtitution, would have been as good a reaſon for not accepting, as for reſigning the command of a regiment. There is certainly an error of the preſs, or an affected obſcurity in the paragraph, where you ſpeak of your bargain with colonel Giſborne. Inſtead of attempting to anſwer what I really do not underſtand, permit me to explain to the public what you really know. In exchange for your regiment, you accepted of a colonel's half-pay (at leaſt 220l a year) and an annuity of 200l. for your own and lady Draper's life jointly.—And is this the loſing bargain, which you would repreſent to us, as if you had given up an income of 800l. a year for 380l? Was it decent, was it honourable, in a man who pretends to love the army, and calls himſelf a ſoldier, to make a traffic of the royal favour, and to turn the higheſt honour of an active profeſſion, into a ſordid proviſion for himſelf and his family? It were unworthy of me to preſs your farther. The contempt with which the whole army heard of the manner of your retreat, aſſures me that as your conduct was not juſtified by precedent, it will never be thought an example for imitation.

The laſt and moſt important queſtion remains. When you receive your half pay, do you or do you not, take a ſolemn oath, or ſign a declaration upon honour to the following effect? *That you do not actually hold any place of profit, civil or military, under his Majeſty.* The charge which this queſtion plainly conveys againſt you, is of ſo ſhocking a complexion, that I ſincerely wiſh you may be able to anſwer it well, not merely for the colour of your reputation, but for your own inward peace of mind.

JUNIUS.

P. S. I

P. S. I had determined to leave the Commander in Chief in the quiet enjoyment of his friend and his bottle; but Titus deſerves an anſwer, and ſhall have a compleat one.

LETTER. VI.

A LETTER OF SIR WILLIAM DRAPER TO JUNIUS.

SIR, *February*, 25, 1769.

I HAVE a very ſhort anſwer for Junius's important queſtion: I do not either take an oath, or declare upon honour, that I have no *place* of profit, *civil* or *military*, when I receive the half-pay as an Iriſh colonel. My moſt gracious Sovereign gives it me as a penſion; he was pleaſed to think I deſerved it. The annuity of 200l. Iriſh, and the equivalent for the half-pay together, produces no more than 380l. *per annum*, clear of fees and perquiſites of office. I receive 167l. from my government of Yarmouth. Total 547l. *per annum*. My conſcience is much at eaſe in theſe particulars; my friends need not bluſh for me.

Junius makes much and frequent uſe of interrogations: they are arms that may be eaſily turned againſt himſelf. I could, by malicious interrogation, diſturb the peace of the moſt virtuous man in the kingdom? I could take the decalouge, and ſay to one man, Did you never ſteal? To the next, Did you never commit murder? and to Junius himſelf, who is putting my life and conduct to the rack, Did you never bear *falſe witneſs* againſt thy *neighbour*? Junius muſt eaſily ſee, that unleſs he affirms to the contrary in his real

real name, ſome people who may be as ignorant of him as I am, will be apt to ſuſpect him of having deviated a little from the truth: therefore let Junius aſk no more queſtions. You bite againſt a file: ceaſe viper.

WILLIAM DRAPER.

LETTER VII.

TO SIR WILLIAM DRAPER KNIGHT OF THE BATH.

SIR, *March* 3, 1769.

AN academical education has given you an unlimited command over the moſt beautiful figures of ſpeech. Maſks, hatchets, racks, and vipers, dance through your letters in all the mazes of metaphorical confuſion. Theſe are the gloomy companions of a diſturbed imagination; the melancholy madneſs of poetry, without the inſpiration. I will not contend with you in point of compoſition. You are a ſcholar, Sir William, and, if I am truly informed, you write Latin with almoſt as much purity as Engliſh. Suffer me then, for I am a plain unlettered man, to continue that ſtile of interrogation, which ſuits my capacity, and to which, conſidering the readineſs of your anſwers, you ought to have no objection. Even Mr. Bingley promiſes to anſwer, if put to the torture.

Do you then really think that, if I were to aſk a *moſt virtuous man* whether he ever committed theft, or murder, it would diſturb his peace of mind? Such a queſtion might perhaps diſcompoſe the gravity of his muſcles, but I believe it would little affect the tranquility

quility of his conſcience. Examine your own breaſt, Sir William, and you will diſcover, that reproaches and enquiries have no power to afflict either the man of unblemiſhed integrity or the abandoned profligate. It is the middle compound character which alone is vulnerable: the man, who, without firmneſs enough to avoid a diſhonourable action, has feeling enough to be aſhamed of it.

I thank you for your hint of the decalogue, and ſhall take an opportunity of applying it to ſome of your moſt virtuous friends in both houſes of parliament.

You ſeem to have dropped the affair of your regiment; ſo let it reſt. When you are appointed to another, I dare ſay you will not ſell it either for a groſs ſum, or for any annuity upon lives.

I am truly glad (for really, Sir William, I am not your enemy, nor did I begin this conteſt with you) that you have been able to clear yourſelf of a crime, though at the expence of the higheſt indiſcretion. You ſay that your half-pay was given you by way of penſion. I will not dwell upon the ſingularity of uniting in your own perſon two ſorts of proviſion, which in their own nature, and in all military and parliamentary views, are incompatible; but I call upon you to juſtify that declaration, wherein you charge your Sovereign with having done an act in your favour notoriouſly againſt law. The half-pay, both in Ireland and England, is appropriated by parliament; and if it be given to perſons, who, like you, are legally incapable of holding it, it is a breach of law. It would have been more decent in you, to have called this diſhonourable tranſaction by its true name; a job to accommodate two perſons, by particular

cular intereſt and management at the caſtle. What ſenſe muſt government have had of your ſervices, when the rewards they had given you are only a diſgrace to you!

And now Sir William, I ſhall take my leave of you for ever. Motives very different from any apprehenſion of your reſentment, make it impoſſible you ſhould ever know me. In truth, you have ſome reaſon to hold yourſelf indebted to me. From the leſſons I have given, you may collect a profitable inſtruction for your future life. They will either teach you ſo to regulate your conduct, as to be able to ſet the moſt malicious inquiries at defiance; or, if that be a loſt hope, they will teach you prudence enough not to attract the public attention upon a character, which will only paſs without cenſure, when it paſſes without obſervation.

JUNIUS.

LETTER VIII.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *March* 18, 1769.

BEFORE you were placed at the head of affa irs, it had been a maxim of the Engliſh government, not unwillingly admitted by the people, that every ungracious or ſevere exertion of the prerogative ſhould be placed to the account of the miniſter; but that whenever an act of graee or benevolence was to be performed, the whole merit of it ſhould be attributed to the Sovereign himſelf. It was a wiſe doctrine, my lord, and equally advantageous to the King and to his

his ſubjects; for while it preſerved that ſuſpicious attention, with which the people ought always to examine the conduct of miniſters, it tended at the ſame time rather to increaſe than diminiſh that attachment to the perſon of their Sovereign. If there be not a fatality attending every meaſure you are concerned in, by what treachery, or by what exceſs of folly has it happened, that thoſe ungracious acts, which have diſtinguiſhed your adminiſtration, and which I doubt not were entirely your own, ſhould carry with them a ſtrong appearance of perſonal intereſt, and even of perſonal enmity in a quarter, where no ſuch intereſt or enmity can be ſuppoſed to exiſt, without the higheſt injuſtice and the higheſt diſhonour? On the other hand, by what judicious management have you contrived it, that the only act of mercy, to which you ever adviſed your Sovereign, far from adding to the luſtre of a character truly gracious and benevolent, ſhould be received with univerſal diſapprobation and diſguſt! I ſhall conſider it as a miniſterial meaſure, my lord duke, becauſe you are the miniſter.

As long as the trial of this chairman was depending, it was natural enough that government ſhould give him every poſſible encouragement and ſupport. The honourable ſervice for which he was hired, and the ſpirit with which he performed it, made a common cauſe between your grace and him. The miniſter, who by ſecret corruption invades the freedom of elections, and the ruffian, who by open violence deſtroys that freedom, are embarked in the ſame bottom. They have the ſame intereſts, and mutually feel for each other. To do juſtice to your grace's humanity, you felt for Mac Quirk as you ought to do, and if you had been contented to aſſiſt him indirectly, without

out a notorious denial of juſtice; or openly inſulting the ſenſe of the nation, you might have ſatisfied every duty of political friendſhip, without commiting the honour of your Sovereign, or hazarding the reputation of his government. But when this unhappy man had been ſolemnly tried, convicted and condemned; —when it appeared that he had been frequently employed in the ſame ſervices, and that no excuſe for him could be drawn either from the innocence of his former life, or the ſimplicity of his character, was it not hazarding too much, to interpoſe the ſtrength of the prerogative between this felon and the juſtice of his country? You ought to have known that an example of this ſort was never ſo neceſſary as at preſent; and certainly you muſt have known that the lot could not have fallen upon a more guilty object. What ſyſtem of government is this? You are perpetually complaining of the riotious diſpoſition of the lower claſs of people, yet when the laws have given you the means of making an example, in every ſenſe unexceptionable, and by far the moſt likely to awe the multitude, you pardon the offence, and are not aſhamed to give the ſanction of government to the riots you complain of, and even to future murders. You are partial perhaps to the military mode of execution, and had rather ſee a ſcore of theſe wretches butchered by the guards, than one of them ſuffer death by regular courſe of law. How does it happen, my lord, that, in *your* hands, even the mercy of the prerogative is cruelty and oppreſſion to the ſubject.

The meaſure it ſeems was ſo extraordinary, that you thought it neceſſary to give ſome reaſons for it to the public. Let them be fairly examined.

1. You ſay *that Meſſrs. Bromfield and Starling were*

were not examined at Mac Quirk's trial. I will tell your grace why they were not. They must have been examined upon oath; and it was foreseen, that their evidence would either not benefit, or might be prejudicial to the prisoner. Otherwise, is it conceivable that his counsel should neglect to call in such material evidence?

2. You say *that Mr. Foote did not see the deceased until after his death.* A surgeon, my lord, must know very little of his profession, if upon examining a wound, or a contusion, he cannot determine whether it was mortal or not.—While the party is alive a surgeon will be cautious of pronouncing; whereas by the death of the patient, he is enabled to consider both cause and effect in one view, and to speak with a certainty confirmed by experience.

Yet we are to thank your grace for the establishment of a new tribunal. Your *inquisito post mortem*, is unknown to the laws of England, and does honour to your invention. The only material objection to it is, that if Mr. Foot's evidence was insufficient, because he did not examine the wound till the death of the party, much less can a negative opinion, given by gentlemen who never saw the body of Mr. Clarke, either before or after his decease, authorise you to supersede the verdict of a jury, and sentence of the law.

Now my lord, let me ask you, Has it never occurred to your grace, while you were withdrawing this desperate wretch from that justice which the laws had awarded, and which the whole people of England demanded against him, that there is another man, who is the favourite of his country, whose pardon would have been accepted with gratitude, whose pardon would have healed all our divisions? Have you quite

forgotten that this man was once your grace's friend; Or is it to murderers only that you will extend the mercy of the crown?

Theſe are queſtions you will not anſwer. Nor is it neceſſary. The character of your private life, and the uniform tenour of your public conduct, is an anſwer to them all.

JUNIUS.

LETTER IX.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *April* 10, 1771.

I HAVE ſo good an opinion of your Grace's diſcernment, that when the author of the vindication of your conduct aſſures us, that he writes from his own mere motion, without the leaſt authority from your Grace, I ſhould be ready enough to believe him, but for one fatal mark, which either you perſonal or your political character is concerned.—Your firſt attempt to ſupport Sir William Proctor ended in the election of Mr. Wilkes; the ſecond enſured ſucceſs to Mr. Glyn. The extraordinary ſtep you took to make Sir James Lowther Lord Paramount of Cumberland, has ruined his intereſt in that county for ever. The Houſe Liſt of Directors was curſed with the concurrence of government; and even the miſerable Dingley could not eſcape the misfortune of your grace's protection. With this uniform experience before us, we are authoriſed to ſuſpect, that when a pretended vindication of your principles and conduct in reality contains the bittereſt reflection upon both, it could not have been

been written without your immediate direction and aſſiſtance. The author indeed calls God to witneſs for him, with all the ſincerity, and in the very terms of an Iriſh evidence, *to the beſt of his knowledge and belief.* My Lord, you ſhould not encourage theſe appeals to heaven. The pious Prince, from whom you are ſuppoſed to deſcend, made ſuch frequent uſe of them in his public declarations, that at laſt the people alſo found it neceſſary to appeal to heaven in their turn. Your adminiſtration has driven us into circumſtances of equal diſtreſs;—beware at leaſt how you remind us of the remedy.

You have already much to anſwer for. You have provoked this unhappy gentleman to play the fool once more in public life, in ſpite of his years and infirmities, and to ſhew us that, as you yourſelf are a ſingular inſtance of youth without ſpirit, the man who defends you is a no leſs remarkable example of age without the benefit of experience. To follow ſuch a writer minutely would, like his own periods, be a labour without end. The ſubject too has been already diſcuſſed, and is ſufficiently underſtood. I cannot help obſerving, however, that, when the pardon of Mac Quirk was the principal charge againſt you, it would have been but a decent compliment to your grace's underſtanding, to have defended you upon your own principles. What credit does a man deſerve, who tells us plainly, that the facts ſet forth in the King's proclamation were not the true motives on which the pardon was granted, and that he wiſhes that thoſe chirurgical reports, which firſt gave occaſion to certain doubts in the royal breaſt, had not been laid before his Majeſty. You ſee, my Lord, that even your friends cannot defend your actions, without changing

your principles, nor juſtify a deliberate meaſure of government, without contradicting the main aſſertion on which it was founded.

The conviction of Mac Quirk had reduced you to a dilemma, in which it was hardly poſſible for you to reconcile your political intereſt with your duty. You were obliged either to abandon an active uſeful pattiſan or to protect a felon from public juſtice. With your uſual ſpirit, you preferred your intereſt to every other conſideration; and with your uſual judgment, you founded your determination upon the only motives which ſhould not have been given to the public.

I have frequently cenſured Mr. Wilkes's conduct, yet your advocate reproaches me with having devoted myſelf to the ſervice of ſedition. Your Grace can beſt inform us, for which of Mr. Wilkes's good qualities you firſt honoured him with your friendſhip or how long it was before you diſcovered thoſe bad ones in him, at which, it ſeems, your delicacy was offended. Remember, my Lord, that you continued your connexion with Mr. Wilkes long after he had been convicted of thoſe crimes, which you have ſince taken pains to repreſent in the blackeſt colours of blaſphemy and treaſon. How unlucky is it, that the firſt inſtance you have given us of a ſcrupulous regard to decorum is united with the breach of a moral obligation! For my own part, my Lord, I am proud to affirm, that, if I had been weak enough to form ſuch a friendſhip, I would never have been baſe enough to betray it. But, let Mr Wilkes's character be what it may, this at leaſt is certain, that, circumſtanced as he his with regard to the public, even his vices plead for him. The people of England have too much diſcernment to ſuffer your Grace to take advantage of

the

the failings of a private character, to eſtabliſh a precedent by which the public liberty is affected, and which you may hereafter, with equal eaſe and ſatisfaction, employ to the ruin of the beſt men in the kingdom.—Content yourſelf, my lord, with the many advantages, which the unſullied purity of your own character has given you over your unhappy deſerted friend. Avail yourſelf of all the unforgiving piety of the court you live in, and bleſs God that you "are not as other men are; extortioners, unjuſt, "adulterers, or even as this publican." In a heart void of feeling, the laws of honour and good faith may be violated with impunity, and there you may ſafely indulge your genius. But the laws of England ſhall not be violated, even by your holy zeal to oppreſs a ſinner; and though you have ſucceeded in making him the tool, you ſhall not make him the victim of your ambition.

JUNIUS.

A MONODY; OR THE TEARS OF SEDITION ON THE DEATH OF JUNIUS.

Quies tibi Silure furor?

AND are theſe periods fill'd with tuneful care,
Theſe thoughts which gleam'd with Ciceronian ore,
Are they my *Junius*, paſs'd like vulgar air,
Droop'd is thy plume, to riſe on Fame no more?

Thy plume!—it was the harp of ſong in proſe:
Oft has its numbers ſooth'd the felon's ear,
Oft to its tune my Wilkite heroes roſe
With couch'd tobacco-pipes in acts to ſpear.

Where now ſhall ſtormy *Clodius* and his crew,
My dear aſſembly to the midnight hour,
Ah! where acquire a trumpeter?—ſince you
No more ſhall rouze them with your claſſic power.

Accurs'd *Silurus!* blaſted be thy wing!
That grey Scotch wing which led th' unerring dart!
In virtue's cauſe could all that's ſatire ſting
A boſom, which corruption's poiſon fraught?

Impoſſible—then hear me, fiends of hell,
This dark event, this myſtery unfold;
Poiſon'd was *Junius?* No; alas! he fell
"Midſt arrows dipp'd in miniſterial gold."

Then hear me, rioters, of my command,
Condemn the villain to a traitor's doom:
Let none but faithful knaves adorn my band;
Go, ſink this character into his tomb.

Here ſunk an eſſayiſt, of dubious name,
Whoſe tinſel'd page on airy cadence run,
Friendleſs, with party—noted, without fame,
Virtue and vice diſclaim'd him as a ſon.

POETIKASTOS.

LET-

LETTER X.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *April* 12, 1769.

THE monody on the ſuppoſed death of Junius, is not the leſs poetical for being founded on a fiction. In ſome parts of it, there is a promiſe of genius, which deſerves to be encouraged. My letter of Monday will, I hope, convince the author that I am neither a partiſan of Mr. Wilkes, nor yet bought off by the miniſtry. It is true I have refuſed offers, which a more prudent or a more intereſted man would have accepted. Whether it be ſimplicity or virtue in me, I can only affirm that *I am in earneſt*; becauſe I am convinced, as far as my underſtanding is capable of judging, that the preſent miniſtry are driving this country to deſtruction; and you, I think, Sir, may be ſatisfied that my rank and fortune place me above a common bribe.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XI.

TO MR. EDWARD WESTON.

SIR, *April* 21, 1769.

I SAID you were an old man without the benefit of experience. It ſeems you are alſo a volunteer with the ſtipend of twenty commiſſions; and at a period

period when all proſpects are at an end, you are ſtill looking forward to rewards, which you cannot enjoy. No man is better acquainted with the bounty of government than you are.

——*ton impudence,*
Temeraire vieillard, aura ſa recompenſe.

But I will not deſcend to an altercation either with the impotence of your age, or the peeviſhneſs of your diſeaſes. Your pamphlet, ingenious as it is, has been ſo little read, that the public cannot know how far you have a right to give me the lie, without the following citation of your own words.

Page 6.—'1. That he is perſuaded that the motives 'which he (Mr. Weſton) has alledged, muſt appear 'fully ſufficient, with or without the opinions of the 'ſurgeons.

'2. That thoſe very motives MUST HAVE BEEN 'the foundation, on which the Earl of Rochford 'thought proper, &c.

'That he CANNOT BUT REGRET that the Earl of 'Rochford ſeems to have thought proper to lay the 'chirurgical reports before the King, in preference 'to all the other ſufficient motives,' &c.

Let the public determine whether this be defending government on their principles or your own.

The ſtyle and language you have adoptod are, I confeſs, not ill ſuited to the elegance of your own manners, or to the dignity of the cauſe you have undertaken. Every common dawber writes raſcal and villain under his pictures; becauſe the pictures themſelves have neither character nor reſemblance. But the works of a maſter require no index. His features and colouring are taken from nature. The impreſſion they make is immediate and uniform; nor is it poſſible

ble to miſtake his characters, whether they repreſent the treachery of a miniſter, or the abuſed ſimplicity of a King.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XII.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *April* 24, 1769.

THE ſyſtem you ſeemed to have adopted, when Lord Chatham unexpectedly left you at the head of affairs, gave us no promiſe of that uncommon exertion of vigour, which has ſince illuſtrated your character, and diſtinguiſhed your adminiſtration. Far from diſcovering a ſpirit bold enough to invade the firſt rights of the people, and the firſt principles of the conſtitution, you were ſcrupulous of exerciſing even thoſe powers, with which the executive branch of the legiſlature is legally inveſted. We have not yet forgotten how long Mr. Wilkes was ſuffered to appear at large, nor how long he was at liberty to canvaſs for the city and country, with all the terrors of an outlawry hanging over him. Our gracious Sovereign has not yet forgotten the extraordinary care you took of his dignity, and of the ſafety of his perſon, when at a criſis which courtiers affected to call alarming, you left the metropolis expoſed for two nights together, to every ſpecies of riot and diſorder. The ſecurity of the royal reſidence from inſult was then ſufficiently provided for in Mr. Conway's firmneſs and Lord Weymouth's diſcretion; while the Prime Miniſter of Great Britain, in a rural retirement,

retirement, and in the arms of faded beauty, had loſt all memory of his Sovereign, his country and himſelf. In theſe inſtances you might have acted with vigour, for you would have had the ſanction of the laws to ſupport you. The friends of government might have defended you without ſhame, and moderate men, who wiſh well to the peace and good order of ſociety, might have had a pretence for applauding your conduct. But theſe it ſeems were not occaſions worthy of your Grace's interpoſition. You reſerved the proofs of your intrepid ſpirit for trials of greater hazard and importance; and now, as if the moſt diſgraceful relaxation of the executive authority had given you a claim of credit to indulge in exceſſes ſtill more dangerous, you ſeem determined to compenſate amply for your former negligence; and to balance the non-execution of the laws with the breach of the conſtitution. From one extreme you ſuddenly ſtart to the other, without leaving, between the weakneſs and the fury of the paſſions, one moment's interval for the firmneſs of the underſtanding.

Theſe obſervations, general as they are, might eaſily be extended into a faithful hiſtory of your Grace's adminiſtration, and perhaps may be the employment of a future hour. But the buſineſs of the preſent moment will not ſuffer me to look back to a ſeries of events, which ceaſe to be intereſting or important, becauſe they are ſucceeded by a meaſure ſo ſingularly daring, that it excites all our attention, and engroſſes all our reſentment.

Your patronage of Mr. Luttrell has been crowned with ſucceſs. With this precedent before you, with the principles on which it was eſtabliſhed, and with a future houſe of commons, perhaps leſs virtuous than

than the preſent, every county in England, under the auſpices of the treaſury, may be repreſented, as compleatly as the county of Middleſex. Poſterity will be indebted to your Grace for not contenting yourſelf with a temporary expedient, but entailing upon them the immediate bleſſings of your adminiſtration. Boroughs were already too much at the mercy of government. Counties could neither be purchaſed nor intimidated. But their ſolemn determined election may be rejected, and the man they deteſt may be appointed, by another choice, to repreſent them in parliament. Yet it is admitted, that the ſheriffs obeyed the laws and performed their duty. The return they made muſt have been legal and valid, or undoubtedly they would have been cenſured for making it. With every good natured allowance for your Grace's youth and inexperience, there are ſome things which you cannot but know. You cannot but know that the right of the freeholders to adhere to their choice (even ſuppoſing it improperly exerted) was as clear and indiſputable as that of the houſe of commons to exclude one of their own members?—nor is it poſſible for you not to ſee the wide diſtance there is between the negative power of rejecting one man, and the poſitive power of appointing another. The right of expulſion, in the moſt favourable ſenſe, is no more than the cuſtom of parliament. The right of election is the very eſſence of the conſtitution. To violate that right, and much more to transfer it to any other ſet of men, is a ſtep leading immediately to the diſſolution of all government. So far forth as it operates, it conſtitutes a houſe of commons, which does not repreſent the people. A houſe of commons ſo formed would involve a contradiction and the groſſeſt confuſion of ideas; but there

are

are ſome miniſters, my Lord, whoſe views can only be anſwered by reconciling abſurdities, and making the ſame propoſition, which is falſe and abſurd in argument, true in fact.

This meaſure, my Lord, is however attended with one conſequence, favourable with the people, which I am perſuaded you did not foreſee. While the conteſt lay between the miniſtry and Mr. Wilkes, his ſituation and private character gave you advantages over him which common candour, if not the memory of your former friendſhip ſhould have forbidden you to make uſe of. To religious men you had an opportunity of exaggerating the irregularities of his paſt life;—to moderate men you held forth the pernicious conſequences of faction. Men, who with this character, looked no farther than the object before them, were not diſſatisfied at ſeeing Mr. Wilkes excluded from parliament. You have now taken care to ſhift the queſtion; or, rather, you have created a new one, in which Mr. Wilkes is no more concerned than any other Engliſh gentleman. You have united this country againſt you on one grand conſtitutional point, on the deciſion of which our exiſtence, as a free people, abſolutely depends. You have aſſerted, not in words but in fact, that repreſentation in parliament does not depend upon the choice of the freeholder. If ſuch a caſe can poſſibly happen once, it may happen frequently; it may happen always:—and if three hundred votes, by any mode of reaſoning whatſoever, can prevail againſt twelve hundred, the ſame reaſoning would equally have given Mr. Luttrell his ſeat with ten votes, or even with one. The conſequences of this attack upon the conſtitution are too plain and palpable not to alarm the dulleſt apprehenſion. I truſt you will find, that the people

of

of England are neither deficient in ſpirit nor underſtanding, though you have treated them, as if they had neither ſenſe to feel or ſpirit to reſent. We have reaſon to thank God and our anceſtors, that there never yet was a miniſtry in this country, who could ſtand the iſſue of ſuch a conflict; and with every prejudice in favour of your intentions, I ſee no ſuch abilities in your Grace, as ſhould entitle you to ſucceed in an enterprize, in which the ableſt and baſeſt of your predeceſſors have found their deſtruction. You may continue to deceive your gracious maſter with falſe repreſentations of the temper and condition of his ſubjects. You may command a venal vote, becauſe it is the common eſtabliſhed appendage of your office. But never hope that the freeholders will make a tame ſurrender of their rights, or that an Engliſh army will join with you in overturning the liberties of their country. They know that their firſt duty, as citizens, is paramount to all ſubſequent engagements, nor will they prefer the diſcipline or even the honours of their profeſſion to thoſe ſacred original rights, which belonged to them before they were ſoldiers, and which they claim and poſſeſs as the birth-rights of Engliſhmen.

Return, my Lord, before it is too late, to that eaſy inſipid ſyſtem, which you firſt ſet out with. Take back your miſtreſs; the name of friend may be fatal to her, for it leads to treachery and perſecution. Indulge the people. Attend New-market. Mr. Luttrell may again vacate his ſeat; and Mr. Wilkes, if not perſecuted, will ſoon be forgotten. To be weak and inactive is ſafer than to be daring and criminal; and wide is the diſtance between a riot of the populace and a convulſion of the whole kingdom.

are ſome miniſters, my Lord, whoſe views can only be anſwered by reconciling abſurdities, and making the ſame propoſition, which is falſe and abſurd in argument, true in fact.

This meaſure, my Lord, is however attended with one conſequence, favourable with the people, which I am perſuaded you did not foreſee. While the conteſt lay between the miniſtry and Mr. Wilkes, his ſituation and private character gave you advantages over him which common candour, if not the memory of your former friendſhip ſhould have forbidden you to make uſe of. To religious men you had an opportunity of exaggerating the irregularities of his paſt life;—to moderate men you held forth the pernicious conſequences of faction. Men, who with this character, looked no farther than the object before them, were not diſſatisfied at ſeeing Mr. Wilkes excluded from parliament. You have now taken care to ſhift the queſtion; or, rather, you have created a new one, in which Mr. Wilkes is no more concerned than any other Engliſh gentleman. You have united this country againſt you on one grand conſtitutional point, on the deciſion of which our exiſtence, as a free people, abſolutely depends. You have aſſerted, not in words but in fact, that repreſentation in parliament does not depend upon the choice of the freeholder. If ſuch a caſe can poſſibly happen once, it may happen frequently; it may happen always:—and if three hundred votes, by any mode of reaſoning whatſoever, can prevail againſt twelve hundred, the ſame reaſoning would equally have given Mr. Luttrell his ſeat with ten votes, or even with one. The conſequences of this attack upon the conſtitution are too plain and palpable not to alarm the dulleſt apprehenſion. I truſt you will find, that the people

of

of England are neither deficient in ſpirit nor underſtanding, though you have treated them, as if they had neither ſenſe to feel or ſpirit to reſent. We have reaſon to thank God and our anceſtors, that there never yet was a miniſtry in this country, who could ſtand the iſſue of ſuch a conflict; and with every prejudice in favour of your intentions, I ſee no ſuch abilities in your Grace, as ſhould entitle you to ſucceed in an enterprize, in which the ableſt and baſeſt of your predeceſſors have found their deſtruction. You may continue to deceive your gracious maſter with falſe repreſentations of the temper and condition of his ſubjects. You may command a venal vote, becauſe it is the common eſtabliſhed appendage of your office. But never hope that the freeholders will make a tame ſurrender of their rights, or that an Engliſh army will join with you in overturning the liberties of their country. They know that their firſt duty, as citizens, is paramount to all ſubſequent engagements, nor will they prefer the diſcipline or even the honours of their profeſſion to thoſe ſacred original rights, which belonged to them before they were ſoldiers, and which they claim and poſſeſs as the birth-rights of Engliſhmen.

Return, my Lord, before it is too late, to that eaſy inſipid ſyſtem, which you firſt ſet out with. Take back your miſtreſs; the name of friend may be fatal to her, for it leads to treachery and perſecution. Indulge the people. Attend New-market. Mr. Luttrell may again vacate his ſeat; and Mr. Wilkes, if not perſecuted, will ſoon be forgotten. To be weak and inactive is ſafer than to be daring and criminal; and wide is the diſtance between a riot of the populace and a convulſion of the whole kingdom.

You may live to make the experiment, but no honeſt man can wiſh you ſhould ſurvive it.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XIII.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *May* 30, 1769.

IF the meaſures in which you have been moſt ſucceſsful, had been ſupported by any tolerable appearance of argument, I ſhould have thought my time not ill employed, in continuing to examine your conduct as a miniſter, and ſtating it fairly to the public; but when I ſee queſtions of the higheſt national importance carried as they have been, and the firſt principles of the conſtitution openly violated, without argument or decency, I confeſs, I give up the cauſe in deſpair. The meaneſt of your predeceſſors had abilities ſufficient to give a colour to their meaſures. If they invaded the rights of the people, they did not dare to offer a direct inſult to their underſtanding; and, in former times, the moſt venal parliaments made it a condition, in their bargain with the miniſter, that he ſhould furniſh them with ſome plauſible pretences for ſelling their country and themſelves. You have had the merit of introducing a more compendious ſyſtem of government and logic. You neither addreſs yourſelf to the paſſions, nor to the underſtanding, but ſimply to the touch. You apply yourſelf immediately to the feelings of your friends, who, contrary to the forms of parliament, never enter heartily into a debate, until they have divided.

Re-

Relinquiſhing, therefore, all idle views of amendment to your Grace, or of benefit to the public, let me be permitted to conſider your character and conduct merely as a ſubject of curious ſpeculation.—There is ſomething in both, which diſtinguiſhes you not only from all other miniſters, but all other men. It is not that you do wrong by deſign, but that you ſhould never do right by miſtake. It is not that your indolence and your activity have been equally miſapplied, but that the firſt uniform principle, or, if I may ſo call it, the genius of your life, ſhould have carried you through every poſſible change and contradiction of conduct, without the momentary imputation or colour of a virtue; and that the wildeſt ſpirit of inconſiſtency, ſhould never once have betrayed you into a wiſe or honourable action. This I own, gives an air of ſingularity to your fortune, as well as to your diſpoſition. Let us look back together to a ſcene, in which a mind like yours will find nothing to repent of. Let us try, my Lord, how well you have ſupported the various relations in which you ſtood, to your ſovereign, your country your friend, and yourſelf. Give us, if it be poſſible, ſome excuſe to poſterity, and to ourſelves, for ſubmitting to your adminiſtration. If not the abilities of a great miniſter, if not the integrity of a patriot or the fidelity of a friend, ſhew us, at leaſt, the firmneſs of a man.—For the ſake of your miſtreſs, the lover ſhall be ſpared. I will not lead her into public as you have done, nor will I inſult the memory of departed beauty. Her ſex, which alone made her amiable in your eyes, makes her reſpectable in mine.

The character of the reputed anceſtors of ſome men has made it poſſible for their deſcendants to be vici-

ous in the extreme, without being degenerate. Thoſe of your Grace, for inſtance, left no diſtreſſing examples of virtue, even to their legitimate poſterity, and you may look back with pleaſure to an illuſtrious pedigree, in which heraldry has not left a ſingle good quality upon record to inſult or upbraid you. You have better proofs of your deſcent, my Lord, than the regiſter of a marriage, or any troubleſome inheritance of reputation. There are ſome hereditary ſtrokes of character, by which a family may be as clearly diſtinguiſhed as by the blackeſt features of the human face. Charles the Firſt lived and died a hypocrite. Charles the Second was a hypocrite of another ſort, and ſhould have died upon the ſame ſcaffold. At the diſtance of a century, we ſee their different characters happily revived and blended in your Grace. Sullen and ſevere without religion, profligate without gaiety, you live like Charles the Second, without being an amiable companion, and, for aught I know may die as his father did, without the reputation of a martyr.

You had already taken your degrees with credit in thoſe ſchools, in which the Engliſh nobility are formed to virtue, when you were introduced to Lord Chatham's protection. From Newmarket, White's, and the oppoſition, he gave you to the world with an air of popularity, which young men uſually ſet out with, and ſeldom preſerve:—grave and plauſible enough to be thought fit for buſineſs; too young for treachery; and, in ſhort, a patriot of no unpromiſing expectations. Lord Chatham was the earlieſt object of your political wonder and attachment; yet you deſerted him, upon the firſt hopes that offered of an equal ſhare of power with Lord Rockingham. When

When the Duke of Cumberland's firſt negociation failed, and when the favourite was puſhed to the laſt extremity, you ſaved him, by joining with an adminiſtration, in which Lord Chatham had refuſed to engage. Still however he was your friend, and you are yet to explain to the world, why you conſented to act without him, or why, after uniting with Lord Rockingham, you deſerted and betrayed him. You complained that no meaſures were taken to ſatisfy your patron, and that your friend Mr. Wilkes, who had ſuffered ſo much for the party, had been abandoned to his fate. They have ſince contributed, not a little, to your preſent plenitude of power; yet, I think, Lord Chatham has leſs reaſon than ever to be ſatisfied! and as for Mr. Wilkes, it is, perhaps, the greateſt misfortune of his life, that you ſhould have ſo many compenſations to make in the cloſet for your former friendſhip with him. Your gracious maſter underſtands your character, and makes you a perſecutor becauſe you have been a friend.

Lord Chatham formed his laſt adminiſtration upon principles which you certainly concurred in, or you could never have been placed at the head of the Treaſury. By deſerting thoſe principles, and by acting in direct contradiction to them, in which he found you were ſecretly ſupported in the cloſet, you ſoon forced him to leave you to yourſelf, and to withdraw his name from an adminiſtration, which had been formed on the credit of it. You had then a proſpect of friendſhips better ſuited to your genius, and more likely to fix your diſpoſition. Marriage is the point on which every rake is ſtationary at laſt; and truly, my Lord, you may well be weary of the circuit you have taken, for you have now fairly travelled through every ſign in the political zodiac, from the Scorpion, in which

you ſtung Lord Chatham, to the hopes of a Virgin in the houſe of Bloomſbury. One would think that you had had ſufficient experience of the frailty of nuptial engagements, or, at leaſt, that ſuch a friendſhip as the Duke of Bedford's might have been ſecured to you by the auſpicious marriage of your late ducheſs with his nephew. But ties of this tender nature cannot be drawn too cloſe; and it may poſſible be a part of the Duke of Bedford's ambition, after making her an honeſt woman, to work a miracle of the ſame ſort upon your Grace. This worthy Nobleman has long dealt in virtue. There has been a large conſumption of it in his own family; and, in the way of traffic, I dare ſay, he has bought and ſold more than half the repreſentative integrity of the nation.

In a political view, this union is not imprudent. You have now a ſtrength ſufficient to command the the cloſet, and if it be neceſſary to betray one friendſhip more, you may ſet even Lord Bute at defiance. Mr. Stuart Mackenzie may poſſibly remember what uſe the Duke of Bedford uſually makes of his power; and our gracious Sovereign, I doubt not, rejoices at this firſt appearance of union among his ſervants. His late Majeſty, under the happy influence of a family connexion between his miniſters, was relieved from the cares of government. A more active prince may perhaps obſerve, with ſuſpicion, by what degrees an artful ſervant grows upon his maſter; from the firſt unlimited profeſſions of duty and attachment to the painful repreſentation of the neceſſity of the royal ſervice, and ſoon, in regular progreſſion, to the humble inſolence of dictating in all the obſequious forms of peremptory ſubmiſſion. The interval is carefully employed in forming connexions, creating intereſts,

col-

collecting a party, and laying the foundation of double marriages, until the deluded prince, who thought hs had found a creature proſtituted to his ſervice, and inſignificant enough to be always dependant upon his pleaſure, finds him at laſt too ſtrong to be commanded, and too formidable to be removed.

Your Grace's public conduct, as a miniſter, is but the counter-part of your private hiſtory, the ſame inconſiſtency, the ſame contradictions. In America we trace you, from the firſt oppoſition to the Stamp Act, on principles of convenience, to Mr. Pitt's ſurrender of the right; then forward to Lord Rockingham's declaration of the right; then forward to taxation with Mr. Townſhend; and in the laſt inſtance, from the gentle Conway's undetermined diſcretion, to blood and compulſion with the Duke of Bedford; yet if we may believe the ſimplicity of Lord North's eloquenec, at the opening of next ſeſſions, you are once more to be patron of America. Is this the wiſdom of a great miniſter? or is it the vibration of a pendulum? Had you no opinion of your own, my Lord? or was it the gratification of betraying every part with which you have been united, and of deſerting every political principle in which you had concurred.

Your enemies may turn their eyes without regret from this admirable ſyſtem of provincial government; they will find gratification enough in the ſurvey of your domeſtic and foreign policy.

If, inſtead of diſowning, with Lord Shelburne the Britiſh court had interpoſed with dignity and firmneſs, you know, my Lord, that Corſica would never have been invaded. The French ſaw the weakneſs of a diſtracted miniſtry, and were juſtified in treating you with contempt: they would probably have yielded

in

in the firſt inſtance rather than hazard a rupture with this country; but being once engaged, they cannot retreat without diſhonour. Common ſenſe foreſees conſequences which have eſcaped your Grace's penetration. Either we ſuffer the French to make an acquiſition, the importance of which you have probably no conception of, or we oppoſe them by an underhand management, which only diſgraces us in the eyes of Europe, without anſwering any purpoſe of policy or prudence. From ſecret indiſcreet aſſiſtance, a tranſition to ſome more open deciſive meaſures becomes unavoidable, till at laſt we find ourſelves principals in the war, and are obliged to hazard every thing for an object which might have originally been obtained without expence or danger. I am not verſed in the politics of the north; But this I believe is certain, that half the money you have diſtributed to carry the expulſion of Mr. Wilkes, or even your ſecretary's ſhare in the laſt ſubſcription, would have kept the Turks at your devotion. Was it œconomy, my Lord? or did the coy reſiſtance you have conſtantly met with in the Britiſh ſenate, make you deſpair of corrupting the Divan? Your friends indeed have the firſt claim upon your bounty, but if five hundred pounds a year can be ſpared in penſion to Sir John Moore, it would not have diſgraced you to have allowed ſomething to the ſecret ſervice of the public.

You will ſay perhaps that the ſituation of affairs at home demanded and engroſſed the whole of your attention. Here I confeſs you have been active. An amiable accompliſhed prince aſcends the throne, under the happieſt of all auſpices, the acclamations and united affections of his ſubjects. The firſt meaſures

of

of his reign, and even the odium of a favourite, were not able to ſhake their attachments. *Your* ſervices, my Lord, have been more ſucceſsful. Since you were permitted to take the lead, we have ſeen the natural effects of a ſyſtem of government at once both odious and contemptible. We have ſeen the laws ſometimes ſcandalouſly relaxed, ſometimes violently ſtretched beyond their tone. We have ſeen the ſacred perſon of the Sovereign inſulted; and in profound peace, and with an undiſputed title, the fidelity of his ſubjects brought by his own ſervants into a public queſtion. Without abilities, reſolution, or intereſt, you have done more than Lord Bute could accompliſh, with all Scotland at his heels.

Your Grace, little anxious perhaps either for preſent or future reputation, will not deſire to be handed down in theſe colours to poſterity. You have reaſon to flatter yourſelf that the memory of your adminiſtration will ſurvive even the forms of a conſtitution, which our anceſtors vainly hoped would be immortal; and as for your own perſonal character, I will not, for the honour of human nature, ſuppoſe that you can wiſh to have it remembered. The condition of the preſent times is deſperate indeed; but there is a debt due to thoſe who come after us, and it is the hiſtorian's office to puniſh, though he cannot correct. I do not give you to poſterity as a pattern to imitate, but as an example to deter; and as your conduct comprehends every thing that a wiſe or honeſt miniſter ſhould avoid, I mean to make you a negative inſtruction to your ſucceſſors for ever.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XIV.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *July* 8, 1769.

IF nature had given you an underſtanding qualified to keep pace with the wiſhes and principles of your heart, ſhe ſhould have made you, perhaps, the moſt formidable miniſter that ever was employed, under a limited monarch, to accompliſh the ruin of a free people. When neither the feelings of ſhame, the reproaches of conſcience, nor the dread of puniſhment, form any bar to the deſigns of a miniſter, the people would have too much reaſon to lament their condition, if they did not find ſome reſource in the weakneſs of his underſtanding. We owe it to the bounty of Providence, that the compleateſt depravity of the heart is ſometimes ſtrangely united with a confuſion of the mind, which counteracts the moſt favorite principles, and makes the ſame man treacherous without art, and a hypocrite without deceiving. The meaſures, for inſtance, in which your Grace's activity has been chiefly exerted, as they were adopted without ſkill, ſhould have been conducted with more than common dexterity. But truly, my Lord, the execution has been as groſs as the deſign. By one deciſive ſtep, you have defeated all the arts of writing. You have fairly confounded the intrigues of oppoſition, and ſilenced the clamours of faction. A dark ambiguous ſyſtem might require and furniſh the materials of ingenious illuſtration, and, in doubtful meaſures, the virulent exaggeration of party muſt

be

be employed, to rouze and engage the paſſions of the people. You have now brought the merits of your adminiſtration to an iſſue, on which every Engliſhman, of the narroweſt capacity, may determine for himſelf. It is not an alarm to the paſſions, but a calm appeal to the judgement of the people upon their own moſt eſſential intereſts. A more experienced miniſter would not have hazarded a direct invaſion of the firſt principles of the conſtitution, before he had made ſome progreſs in ſubduing the ſpirit of the people. With ſuch a cauſe as yours, my Lord, it is not ſufficient that you have the court at your devotion, unleſs you can find means to corrupt or intimidate the jury. The collective body of the people form that jury, and from their deciſion there is but one appeal.

Whether you have talents to ſupport you, at a criſis of ſuch difficulty and danger, ſhould long ſince have been conſidered. Judging truly of your diſpoſition, you have perhaps miſtaken the extent of our capacity. Good faith and folly have ſo long been received for ſynonimous terms, that the reverſe of the propoſition has grown into credit, and every villain fancies himſelf a man of abilities. It is the apprehenſion of your friends, my Lord, that you have drawn ſome haſty concluſion of this ſort, and that a partial reliance upon your moral character has betrayed you beyond the depth of your underſtanding. You have now carried things too far to retreat. You have plainly declared to the people what they are to expect from the continuance of your adminiſtration. It is time for your Grace to conſider what you may expect in return from *their* ſpirit and *their* reſentment.

Since the acceſſion of our moſt gracious Sovereign to the throne, we have ſeen a ſyſtem of government, which

which may well be called a reign of experiments. Parties of all denominations have been employed and diſmiſſed. The advice of the ableſt men in this country has been repeatedly called for and rejected; and when the royal diſpleaſure has been ſignified to a miniſter, the marks of it have uſually been proportioned to his abilities and integrity. The ſpirit of the FAVOURITE had ſome apparent influence upon every adminiſtration; and every ſet of miniſters preſerved an appearance of duration, as long as they ſubmitted to that influence. But there were certain ſervices to be performed for the Favourite's ſecurity or to gratify his reſentments, which your predeceſſors in office had the wiſdom or the virtue not to undertake. The moment this refractory ſpirit was diſcovered, their diſgrace was determined. Lord Chatham, Mr. Grenville, and Lord Rockingham have ſucceſſively had the honour to be diſmiſſed for preferring their duty, as ſervants of the public, to thoſe compliances which were expected from their ſtation. A ſubmiſſive adminiſtration was at laſt gradually collected from the deſerters of all parties, intereſts and connexions: and nothing remained but to find a leader for theſe gallant well-diſciplined troops. Stand forth, my Lord, for thou art the man. Lord Bute found no reſource of dependance or ſecurity in the proud impoſing ſuperiority of Lord Chatham's abilities, the ſhrewd inflexible judgment of Mr. Grenville, nor in the mild but determined integrity of Lord Rockingham. His views and ſituation required a creature void of all theſe properties; and he was forced to go through every diviſion, reſolution, compoſition, and refinement of political chemiſtry, before he happily arrived at the caput mortuum of vitriol

vitriol in your Grace. Flat and insipid in your retired state, but brought into action, you became vitriol again. Such are the extremes of alternate indolence or fury, which have governed your whole administration. Your circumstances with regard to the people soon becoming desperate, like other honest servants you determined to involve the best of masters in the same difficulties with yourself. We owe it to your Grace's well directed labours, that your Sovereign has been persuaded to doubt of the affections of his subjects, and the people to suspect the virtues of their Sovereign, at a time when both were unquestionable. You have degraded the royal dignity into a base dishonourable competition with Mr. Wilkes, nor had you abilities to carry even the last contemptible triumph over a private man, without the grossest violation of the fundamental laws of the constitution and rights of the people. But these are rights, my Lord, which you can no more annihilate than you can the soil to which they are annexed. The question no longer turns upon points of national honour and security abroad, or on the degrees of expedience and propriety of measures at home. It was not inconsistent that you should abandon the cause of liberty in another country, which you had persecuted in your own; and in the common arts of domestic corruption, we miss no part of Sir Robert Walpole's system except his abilities. In this humble imitative line, you might long have proceeded, safe and contemptible. You might probably never have arisen to the dignity of being hated, and you might even have been despised with moderation. But it seems you meant to be distinguished, and to a mind like yours, there was no other road to fame but by the

deſtruction of a noble fabric, which you thought had been too long the admiration of mankind. The uſe you have made of the military force, introduced an alarming change in the mode of executing the laws. The arbitrary appointment of Mr. Luttrell invades the foundation of the laws themſelves, as it manifeſtly transfers the right of legiſlation from thoſe whom the people have choſen, to thoſe whom they have rejected. With a ſucceſſion of ſuch appointments, we may ſoon ſee a houſe of commons collected, in the choice of which the other towns and counties of England will have as little ſhare as the devoted county of Middleſex.

Yet I truſt your Grace will find that the people of this country are neither to be intimidated by violent meaſures, nor deceived by refinements. When they ſee Mr. Luttrell ſeated in the houſe of commons by mere dint of power, and in direct oppoſition to the choice of a whole county, they will not liſten to thoſe ſubtleties by which every arbitrary exertion of authority is explained into the law and privilege of parliament. It requires no perſuaſion or argument, but ſimply the evidence of the ſenſes, to convince them, that to transfer the right of election from the collective to the repreſentative body of the people, contradicts all thoſe ideas of a houſe of commons, which they have received from their foreſathers, and which they already, though vainly perhaps, delivered to their children. The principles on which this violent meaſure has been defended, have added ſcorn to injury, and forced us to feel, that we were not only oppreſſed but inſulted.

With what force, my Lord, with what protection, are you prepared to meet the united deteſtation of the people

people of England? The city of London has given a generous example to the kingdom, in what manner a king of this country ought to be addreſſed; and I fancy, my Lord, it is not yet in your courage to ſtand between your Sovereign and the addreſſes of his ſubjects. The injuries you have done this country are ſuch as demand not only redreſs, but vengeance. In vain ſhall you look for protection to that venal vote, which you have already paid for; another muſt be purchaſed; and, to ſave a miniſter, the houſe of commons muſt declare themſelves not only independent of their conſtituents, but the determined enemies of the conſtitution. Conſider, my Lord, whether this be an extremity to which their fears will permit them to advance; or, if their protection ſhould fail you, how far you are authoriſed to rely upon the ſincerity of thoſe ſmiles, which a pious court laviſhes without reluctance upon a libertine by profeſſion. It is not indeed the leaſt of the thouſand contradictions which attend you, that a man, marked to the world by the groſſeſt violation of all ceremony and decorum, ſhould be the firſt ſervant of a court, in which prayers are morality, and kneeling is religion. Truſt not too far to appearances, by which your predeceſſors have been deceived, though they have not been injured. Even the beſt of princes may at laſt diſcover that this is a contention in which every thing may be loſt, but nothing can be gained; and as you became miniſter by accident, were adopted without choice, truſted without confidence, and continued without favour, be aſſured that, whenever an occaſion preſſes, you will be diſcarded without even the forms of regret. You will then have reaſon to be thankful, if you are permitted to retire to that ſeat of learning,

which, in contemplation of the ſyſtem of your life, the comparative purity of your manners with thoſe of their high ſteward, and a thouſand other recommending circumſtances, has choſen you to encourage the growing virtue of their youth, and to preſide over their education. Whenever the ſpirit of diſtributing prebends and biſhoprieks ſhall have departed from you, you will find that learned ſeminary perfectly recovered from the delirium of an inſtallation, and, what in truth it ought to be, once more a peaceful ſcene of ſlumber and meditation. The venerable tutors of the univerſity will no longer diſtreſs your modeſty, by propoſing you for a pattern to their pupils. The learned dulneſs of declamation will be ſilent; and even the venal muſe, though happieſt in fiction, will forget your virtues. Yet, for the benefit of the ſucceeding age, I could wiſh that your retreat might be deferred until your morals ſhall happily be ripened to that maturity of corruption, at which philoſophers tell us, the worſt examples ceaſe to be contagious.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XV.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *July* 19, 1769.

A GREAT deal of uſeleſs argument might have been ſaved, in the political conteſt, which has ariſen from the expulſion of Mr. Wilkes, and the ſubſequent appointment of Mr. Luttrel, if the queſtion had been

once

once ſtated with preciſion, to the ſatisfaction of each party, and clearly underſtood by them both. But in this, as in almoſt every other diſpute, it uſually happens that much time is loſt in referring to a multitude of caſes and precedents, which prove nothing to the purpoſe, or in maintaining propoſitions, which are either not diſputed, or, whether they be admitted or denied, are entirely indifferent as to the matter in debate; until at laſt the mind, perplexed and confounded with the endleſs ſubtleties of controverſy, loſes ſight of the main queſtion, and never arrives at truth. Both parties in the diſpute are apt enough to practiſe theſe diſhoneſt artifices. The man who is conſcious of the weakneſs of his cauſe, is intereſted in concealing it; and on the other ſide, it is not uncommon to ſee a good cauſe mangled by advocates who do not know the real ſtrength of it.

I ſhould be glad to know, for inſtance, to what purpoſe in the preſent caſe, ſo many precedents have been produced to prove, that the houſe of commons have a right to expel one of their own members; that it belongs to them to judge of the validity of elections; or that the law of parliament is part of the law of the land? After all theſe propoſitions are admitted, Mr. Luttrell's right to his ſeat will continue to be juſt as diſputable as it was before. Not one of them is at preſent in agitation. Let it be admitted that the houſe of commons were authoriſed to expel Mr. Wilkes; that they are the proper court to judge of elections, and that the law of parliament is binding upon the people; ſtill it remains to be enquired whether the houſe, by their reſolution in favour of Mr. Luttrell, have or have not truly declared that law. To facilitate this enquiry I would have the queſtion cleared of all foreign or in-

different matter. The following ſtate of it will probably be thought a fair one by both parties; and then I imagine there is no gentleman in this country who will not be capable of forming a judicious and true opinion upon it. I take the queſtion to be ſtrictly this: 'Whether or no it be the known eſtabliſhed law 'of parliament, that the expulſion of a member of 'the houſe of commons of itſelf creates in him ſuch 'an incapacity to be re-elected, that, at a ſubſequent 'election, any votes given to him are null and void, 'and that any other candidate, who, except the per-'ſon expelled, has the greateſt number of votes, 'ought to be the ſitting member.'

To prove that the affirmative is the law of parliament, I apprehend it is not ſufficient for the preſent houſe of commons to declare it to be ſo. We may ſhut our eyes indeed to the dangerous conſequences of ſuffering one branch of the legiſlature to declare new laws, without argument or example, and it may perhaps be prudent enough to ſubmit to authority; but a mere aſſertion will never convince, much leſs will it be thought reaſonable to prove the right by the fact itſelf. The miniſtry have not yet pretended to ſuch a tyranny over our minds. To ſupport the affirmative fairly, it will either be neceſſary to produce ſome ſtatute in which that poſitive proviſion ſhall have been made, that ſpecific diſability clearly created, and the conſequences of it declared; or, if there be no ſuch ſtatute, the cuſtom of parliament muſt then be referred to, and ſome caſes, ſtrictly in point, muſt be produced, with the deciſion of the court upon them; for I readily admit the cuſtom of parliament, once clearly proved, is equally binding with the common and ſtatute law.

The

The conſideration of what may be reaſonable or unreaſonable makes no part of this queſtion. We are enquiring what the law is, not what it ought to be. Reaſon may be applied to ſhew the impropriety or expedience of a law, but we muſt have either ſtatute or precedent to prove the exiſtence of it. At the ſame time, I do not mean to admit that the late reſolution of the houſe of commons is defenſible on general principles of reaſon, any more than in law. This is not the hinge on which the debates turns.

Suppoſing therefore that I have laid down an accurate ſtate of the queſtion, I will venture to affirm, 1ſt. That there is no ſtatute exiſting by which that ſpecific diſability, which we ſpeak of, is created. If there be, let it be produced. The argument will then be at an end.

2dly. That there is no precedent in all the proceedings of the houſe of commons, which comes entirely home to the preſent caſe, viz. 'where an expelled member has been returned again, and another candidate, with an inferior number of votes, has been declared the ſitting member.' If there be ſuch a precedent, let it be given to us plainly, and I am ſure it will have more weight than all the cunning arguments which have been drawn from inferences and probabilities.

The miniſtry, in that laborious pamphlet which I preſume contains the whole ſtrength of the party, have declared, 'That Mr. Walpole's was the firſt 'and only inſtance, in which the electors of any 'county or borough had returned a perſon expelled 'to ſerve in the ſame parliament.' It is not poſſible to conceive a caſe more exactly in point. Mr. Walpole was expelled, and, having a majority of votes at the

the next election, was returned again. The friends of Mr. Taylor, a candidate ſet up by the miniſtry, petitioned the houſe that he might be the ſitting member. Thus far the circumſtances tally exactly, except that our houſe of commons ſaved Mr. Luttrell the trouble of petitioning. The point of law however was the ſame. It came regularly before the houſe, and it was their buſineſs to determine upon it. They did determine upon it. They did determine it, for they declared Mr. Taylor *not duly elected.* If it be ſaid that they meant this reſolution as a matter of favour and indulgence to the borough, which had retorted Mr. Walpole upon them, in order that the burgeſſes, knowing what the law was, might correct their error, I anſwer,

I. That is a ſtrange way of arguing to oppoſe a ſuppoſition, which no man can prove, to a fact which proves itſelf.

II. That if this were the intention of the houſe of commons, it muſt have defeated itſelf. The burgeſſes of Lynn could never have known their error, much leſs could they have ever corrected it, by any inſtruction they received from the proceedings of the houſe of commons. They might perhaps have foreſeen, that, if they returned Mr. Walpole again he would again be rejected; but they never could infer, from a reſolution by which the candidate with the feweſt votes was declared *not duly elected*, that at a future election, and in ſimilar circumſtances, the houſe of commons would reverſe their reſolution, and receive the ſame candidate as duly elected, whom they had before rejected.

This indeed would have been a moſt extraordinary way of declaring the law of parliament, and what I preſume

preſume no man, whoſe underſtanding is not at croſs purpoſes with itſelf, could poſſibly underſtand.

If in a caſe of this importance, I thought myſelf at liberty to argue from ſuppoſitions rather than from facts, I think the probability in this caſe is directly the reverſe of what the miniſtry affirm; and that it is much more likely that the houſe of commons at that time would rather have ſtrained a point in favour of Mr. Taylor, than that they would have violated the law of parliament, and robbed Mr. Taylor of a right legally veſted in him, to gratify a refractory borough, which, in defiance of them, had returned a perſon branded with the ſtrongeſt mark of the diſpleaſure of the houſe.

But really, Sir, this way of talking, for I cannot call it argument, is a mockery of the common underſtanding of the nation, too groſs to be endured. Our deareſt intereſts are at ſtake. An attempt has been made, not merely to rob a ſingle county of its rights, but, by inevitable conſequence, to alter the conſtitution of the houſe of commons. This fatal attempt has ſucceeded, and ſtands as a precedent recorded for ever. If the miniſtry are unable to defend their cauſe by fair argument founded on facts, let them ſpare us at leaſt the mortification of being amuſed and deluded like children. I believe there is yet a ſpirit of reſiſtance in this country, which will not ſubmit to be oppreſſed; but I am ſure there is a fund of good ſenſe in this country, which cannot be deceived.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER XVI.

TO DR. WILLIAM BLACKSTONE, SOLICITOR GENERAL TO HER MAJESTY.

SIR, *July* 29, 1769.

I SHALL make you no apology for conſidering a certain pamphlet, in which your late conduct is defended, as written by yourſelf. The perſonal intereſt, the perſonal reſentments, and above all, that wounded ſpirit unaccuſtomed to reproach, and I hope not frequently conſcious of deſerving it, are ſignals which betray the author to us as plainly, as if your name were in the title-page. You appeal to the public in defence of your reputation. We hold it, Sir, that an injury offered to an individual is intereſting to ſociety. On this principle the people of England made a common cauſe with Mr. Wilkes. On this principle, if *you* are injured, they will join in your reſentment. I ſhall not follow you through the inſipid form of a third perſon, but addreſs myſelf to you directly.

You ſeem to think the channel of a pamphlet more reſpectable and better ſuited to the dignity of your cauſe, that that of a news-paper. Be it ſo. Yet if news-papers are ſcurrilous, you muſt confeſs they are impartial. They give us, without any apparant preference, the wit and argument of the miniſtry, as well as the abuſive dulneſs of the oppoſition. The ſcales are equally poiſed. It is not the printer's fault if the greater weight inclines the balance.

Your pamphlet then is divided into an attack upon Mr. Grenville's character, and a defence of your own.

own. It would have been more conſiſtent perhaps with your profeſſed intentions, to have confined yourſelf to the laſt. But anger has ſome claim to indulgence, and railing is uſually a relief to the mind. I hope you have found benefit from the experiment. It is not my deſign to enter into a formal vindication of Mr. Grenville upon his own principles. I have neither the honour of being perſonally known to him, nor do I pretend to be completely maſter of all the facts. I need not run the riſque of doing an injuſtice to his opinions, or to his conduct, when your pamphlet alone carries, upon the face of it, a full vindication of both.

Your firſt reflection is, that Mr. Grenville was of all men the perſon, who ſhould not have complained of inconſiſtence with regard to Mr. Wilkes. This, Sir, is either an unmeaning ſneer, a peeviſh expreſſion of reſentment, or if it means any thing, you plainly beg the queſtion; for whether his parliamentary conduct with regard to Mr. Wilkes, has or has not been inconſiſtent, remains yet to be proved. But it ſeems he received upon the ſpot a ſufficient chaſtiſement for exerciſing *ſo unfairly* his talent of miſrepreſentation. You are a lawyer, Sir, and know better than I do, upon what particular occaſions a talent for miſrepreſentation may be *fairly* exerted; but to puniſh a man a ſecond time, when he has been once ſufficiently chaſtiſed, is rather ſevere. It is not in the laws of England; it is not in your own commentaries, nor is it yet, I believe, in the new law you have revealed to the houſe of commons. I hope this doctrine has no exiſtence but in your own heart. After all, Sir, if you had conſulted that ſober diſcretion, which you ſeem to oppoſe with triumph, to the honeſt jollity of

a ta-

a tavern, it might have occurred to you that, although you could have ſucceeded in fixing a charge of inconſiſtence upon Mr. Grenville, it would not have tended in any ſhape to exculpate yourſelf.

Your next inſinuation, that Sir William Meredith had haſtily adopted the falſe gloſſes, of his new ally, is of the ſame ſort with the firſt. It conveys a ſneer as little worthy of the gravity of your character, as it is uſeleſs to your defence. It is of little moment to the public, to enquire by whom the charge was conceived, or by whom it was adopted. The only queſtion we aſk is, whether or not it be true. The remainder of your reflections upon Mr. Grenville's conduct deſtroy themſelves. He could not poſſibly come prepared to traduce your integrity to the houſe. He could not foreſee that you would even ſpeak upon the queſtion, much leſs could he foreſee that you would maintain a direct contradiction of that doctrine, which you had ſolemnly, diſintereſtedly, and upon ſobereſt reflection delivered to the public. He came armed indeed with what he thought a reſpectable authority, to ſupport what he was convinced was the cauſe of truth, and I doubt not he intended to give you, in the courſe of the debate, an honourable and public teſtimoney of his eſteem. Thinking highly of his abilities, I cannot however allow him the gift of divination. As to what you are pleaſed to call a plan coolly formed to impoſe upon the houſe of commons, and his producing it without provocation at midnight, I conſider it as the language of pique and invective, therefore unworthy of regard. But, Sir, I am ſenſible I have followed your example too long, and wandered from the point.

The quotation from your commentaries is matter of record. It can neither be *altered* by your friends,

nor

nor misrepresented by your enemies, and I am willing to take your own word for what you have said in the house of commons. If there be a real difference between what you have written and what you have spoken, you confess that your book ought to be the standard. Now, Sir, if the words mean any thing, I apprehend that, when a long enumeration of disqualifications, (whether by statute or the custom of parliament) concludes with these general comprehensive words, 'but subject to these restrictions and disqualification *every* subject of the 'realm is elegible of common right,' a reader of plain understanding must of course rest satisfied that no species of disqualification whatsoever had been omitted. The known character of the author, and the apparent accuracy with which the whole work is compiled, would confirm him in his opinion; nor could he possibly form any other judgment, without looking upon your commentaries in the same light in which you consider those penal laws, which though not repealed, are fallen into disuse, and are now in effect A SNARE TO THE UNWARY.

You tell us indeed that it was not part of your plan to specify any temporary incapacity, and that you could not, without a spirit of prophecy, have specified the disability of a private individual, subsequent to the period at which you wrote. What your plan was I know not; but what it should have been, in order to compleat the work you have given us, is by no means difficult to determine. The incapacity, which you call temporary, may continue seven years; and though you might not have foreseen the particular case of Mr. Wilkes, you might and should have foreseen the possibility of *such* a case,

and told us how far the houſe of commons were authoriſed to proceed in it by the law and cuſtom of parliament. The freeholders of Middleſex would then have known what they had to truſt to, and would never have returned Mr. Wilkes, when colonel Lutrell was a candidate againſt him. They would have choſe ſome indifferent perſon rather than ſubmit to be repreſented by the object of their contempt and deteſtation.

Your attempt to diſtinguiſh between diſabilities, which affect whole claſſes of men, and thoſe which affect individuals only, is really unworthy of your underſtanding. Your commentaries had taught me that, although the inſtance in which a penal law is exerted be particular, the laws themſelves are general. They are made for the benefit and inſtruction of the public, though the penalty falls only upon an individual. You cannot but know, Sir, that what was Mr. Wilkes's caſe yeſterday, may be yours or mine to-morrow, and that conſequently the common right of every ſubject of the realm is invaded by it. Profeſſing therefore to treat of the conſtitution of the houſe of commons, and of the laws and cuſtoms relative to that conſtitution, you certainly were guilty of a moſt unpardonable omiſſion, in taking no notice of a right and privilege of the houſe, more extraordinary and more arbitrary than all the others they poſſeſs put together. If the expulſion of a member, not under any other legal diſability, of itſelf creates in him an incapacity to be re-elected, I ſee a ready way marked out, by which the majority may at any time remove the honeſteſt and ableſt men who happen to be in oppoſition to them. To ſay that they *will not* make this extravagant uſe of

their

their power, would be a language unfit for a man ſo learned in the laws as you are. By your doctrine, Sir, they *have* the power, and laws you know are intended to guard againſt what men *may* do, not to truſt to what they *will* do.

Upon the whole, Sir, the charge againſt you is of a plain, ſimple nature; it appears even upon the face of your own pamphlet. On the contrary, your juſtification of yourſelf is full of ſubtilty and reſentment, and in ſome places not very intelligible. If I were perſonally your enemy, I ſhould dwell, with a malignant pleaſure, upon thoſe great and uſeful qualifications, which you certainly poſſeſs, and by which you once acquired, though they could not preſerve to you the reſpect and eſteem of your country. I ſhould enumerate the honours you have loſt, and the virtues you have diſgraced: but having no private reſentments to gratify, I think it ſufficient to have given my opinion of your public conduct, leaving the puniſhment it deſerves to your cloſet and to yourſelf.

JUNIUS.

Poſtſcript to a Pamphlet intitled, 'An Anſwer to 'the Queſtion ſtated.' Supposed to be written by Dr. Blackſtone, Solicitor to the Queen, in anſwer to Junius's Letter.

SINCE theſe papers were ſent to the preſs, a writer in the public papers, who ſubſcribes himſelf Junius, has made a feint of bringing this queſtion to a ſhort iſſue. Though the foregoing obſervations contain in my opinion, at leaſt, a full refutation of

all that this writer has offered, I ſhall however, beſtow a very few words upon him. It will coſt me very little trouble to unravel and expoſe the ſophiſtry of his argument.

'I take the queſtion, ſays he, to be ſtrictly this: 'Whether or not it be the known eſtabliſhed law 'of parliament, that the expulſion of a member of 'the houſe of commons, of itſelf creates in him 'ſuch an incapacity to be re-elected, that, at a ſub-'ſequent election, any votes given to him are null 'and void; and that any other candidate, who, ex-'cept the perſon expelled, has the greateſt number 'of votes, ought to be the ſitting member.'

Waving for the preſent any objection I may have to this ſtate of the queſtion, I ſhall venture to meet our champion upon his own ground; and attempt to ſupport the affirmative of it, in one of the two ways, by which he ſays it can be alone fairly ſupported. 'If there be no ſtatute, ſays he, in which 'the ſpecific diſability is clearly created, &c. (and 'we acknowledge there is none) the cuſtom of par-'liament muſt then be referred to, and ſome caſe or 'caſes, ſtrictly in point, muſt be produced, with the 'deciſion of the court upon them.' Now I aſſert, that this has been done. Mr. Walpole's caſe is ſtrictly in point, to prove that expulſion creates abſolute incapacity of being re-elected. This was the clear deciſion of the houſe upon it; and was a full declaration, that incapacity was the neceſſary conſequence of expulſion. The law was as clearly and firmly fixed by this reſolution, and is as binding in every ſubſequent caſe of expulſion, as if it had been declared by an expreſs ſtatute, 'That a member ex-'pelled by a reſolution of the houſe of commons

'ſhall

'ſhall be deemed incapable of being re-elected.' Whatever doubt then there might have been of the law before Mr. Walpole's caſe, with reſpect to the full operation of a vote of expulſion creates abſolute incapacity in law of being re-elected.

But capacity in law in this inſtance muſt have the ſame operation and effect with incapacity in law in every other inſtance. Now, incapacity of being re-elected implies in its very terms, that any votes given to the incapable perſon, at a ſubſequent election, are null and void. This is its neceſſary operation, or it has no operation at all. It is *vox et prætereà nihil.* We can no more be called upon to prove this propoſition, than we can to prove that a dead man is not alive, or that twice two are four. When the terms are underſtood, the propoſition is ſelf-evident.

Laſtly, It is in all caſes of election, the known and eſtabliſhed law of the land, grounded upon the cleareſt principles of reaſon and common ſenſe, that if the votes given to one candidate are null and void, they cannot be oppoſed to the votes given to another candidate. They cannot affect the votes of ſuch candidate at all. As they have, on the one hand, no poſitive quality to add or eſtabliſh, ſo have they, on the other hand, no negative one to ſubſtract or deſtroy. They are, in a word, a mere non-entity. Such was the determination of the houſe of commons in the Malden and Bedford elections; caſes ſtrictly in point to the preſent queſtion, as far as they are meant to be in point. And to ſay that they are not in point, in all circumſtances, in thoſe particularly which are independent of the propoſition which they are quoted to prove, is to ſay no more than that Malden is not Middleſex, nor Serjeant Comyns Mr. Wilkes.

Let us ſee then how our proof ſtands. Expulſion creates incapacity; incapacity annihiates any votes given to the incapable perſon. The votes given to the qualified candidate ſtand upon their own bottom, firm, and untouched, and can alone have effect. This, one would think, would be ſufficient. But we are ſtopped ſhort, and told, that none of our precedents come home to the preſent caſe; and are challenged to produce 'a precedent in all the proceedings of the houſe of commons that does come home to it, viz. *where an expelled member has been returned again, and another candidate, with an inferior number of votes, has been declared ſitting member.*'

Inſtead of a precedent, I will beg leave to put a caſe; which, I fancy, will be quite as deciſive to the preſent point. Suppoſe another Sacheverel, (and every party muſt have its Sacheverel) ſhould, at ſome future election, take it into his head to offer himſelf a candidate for the county of Middleſex. He is oppoſed by a candidate, whoſe coat is of a different colour; but however of a very good colour. The divine has an indiſputable majority; nay, the poor layman is abſolutely diſtanced. The ſheriff, after having had his conſcience well informed by the reverend caſuiſt, returns him, as he ſuppoſes, duly elected. The whole houſe in an uproar, at the apprehenſion of ſo ſtrange an appearance amongſt them. A motion however is at length made, that the perſon was incapable of being elected, that his competitor ought to have been returned. No, ſays a great orator, Firſt, ſhew me your law for this proceeding. 'Either produce me a ſtatute, in 'which the ſpecific diſability of a clergyman is 'created;

'created; or, produce me a precedent *where a clergyman has been returned, and another candidate, with an inferior number of votes, has been declared the ſitting member.*' No ſuch ſtatute, no ſuch precedent to be found. What anſwer then is to be given to this demand? The very ſame anſwer which I will give to that of Junius: That there is more than one precedent in the proceedings of the houſe—'where an incapable perſon has been returned, and 'another candidate, with an inferior number of 'votes, has been declared the ſitting member; and 'that this is the known and eſtabliſhed law, in all 'caſes of incapacity, from whatever cauſe it may ariſe.'

I ſhall now therefore beg leave to make a ſlight amendment to Junius's ſtate of the queſtion; the affirmative of which will ſtand thus:

'It is the known and eſtabliſhed law of parliament, that the expulſion of any member of the 'houſe of commons creates in him an incapacity of 'being re-elected; that any votes given to him at a 'ſubſequent election are, in conſequence of ſuch 'incapacity, null and void; and that any other candidate, who, except the perſon rendered incapable, 'has the greateſt number of votes, ought to be the 'ſitting member.

But our buſineſs is not yet quite finiſhed. Mr. Walpole's caſe muſt have a re-hearing. 'It is not 'poſſible, ſays this writer, to conceive a caſe more 'exactly in point. Mr. Walpole was expelled, and 'having a majority of votes at the next election, was 'returned again. The friends of Mr. Taylor, a 'candidate ſet up by the miniſtry, petitioned the 'houſe, that he might be the ſitting member. Thus

'far

'far the circumſtances tally exactly, except that 'our houſe of commons ſaved Mr. Luttrell the 'trouble of petitioning. The point of law, how-'ever, was the ſame. It came regularly before the 'houſe, and it was their buſineſs to determine up-'on it. They did determine it; for they declared 'Mr. Taylor *not duly elected.*'

Inſtead of examining the juſtneſs of this repreſentation, I ſhall beg leave oppoſe againſt it my own view of this caſe, in as plain a manner and as few words as I am able.

It was the known and eſtabliſhed law of parliament, when the charge againſt Mr. Walpole came before the houſe of commons, that they had power to expel, to diſable, and to render incapable for offences. In virtue of this power they expelled him.

Had they, in the very vote of expulſion, adjudged him, in terms, to be incapable of being re-elected, there muſt have been at once an end with him. But though the right of the houſe, both to expel, and adjudge incapable, was clear and indubitable, it does not appear to me, that the full operation and effect of a vote of expulſion ſingly was ſo. The law in this caſe had never been expreſsly declared. There had been no event to call up ſuch a declaration. I trouble not myſelf with the grammatical meaning of the word expulſion. I regard only its legal meaning. This was not as I think, preciſely fixed. The houſe thought proper to fix it, and explicitly to declare the full conſequences of their former vote before they ſuffered theſe conſequences to take effect. And in this proceeding they acted upon the moſt liberal and ſolid principles of equity, juſtice,

juſtice, and law. What then did the burgeſſes of Lynn collect from this ſecond vote? Their ſubſequent conduct will tell us; it will with certainty tell us, that they conſidered it as deciſive againſt Mr. Walpole; it will alſo, with equal certainty, tell us, that, upon ſuppoſition that the law of election ſtood then, as it does now, and that they knew it to ſtand thus, they inferred, 'that at a future election, and 'in caſe of a ſimilar return, the houſe would re-'ceive the ſame candidate, as duly elected, whom 'they had before rejected.' They could infer nothing but this.

It is needleſs to repeat the circumſtance of diſſimilarity in the preſent caſe. It will be ſufficient to obſerve, that as the law of parliament, upon which the houſe of commons grounded every ſtep of their proceedings, was clear beyond the reach of doubt, ſo neither could the freeholders of Middleſex be at a loſs to foreſee what muſt be the inevitable conſequence of their proceedings in oppoſition to it. For upon every return of Mr. Wilkes, the houſe made enquiry, whether any votes were given to any other candidate.

But I could venture for the experiment's ſake, even to give this writer the utmoſt he aſks; to allow the moſt perfect ſimilarity throughout in theſe two caſes; to allow, that the law of expulſion was quite clear to the burgeſſes of Lynn, as to the freeholders of Middleſex. It will, I am confident, avail his cauſe but little. It will only prove, that the law of election at that time was different from the preſent law. It will prove, that in all caſes of an incapable candidate returned, the law then was, that the whole election ſhould be void. But now

we

we know that this is not law. The cases of Malden and Bedford were, and has been seen determined upon other and more just principles. And these determinations are, I imagine, admitted on all sides, to be law.

I would willingly draw a veil over the remaining part of this paper. It is astonishing, it is painful, to see men of parts and ability, giving into the most unworthy artifices, and descending so much below their true line of character. But if they are not the dupes of their sophistry, (which is hardly to be conceived) let them consider that they are something much worse.

The dearest interests of this country are its laws and its constitution. Against every attack upon these, there will, I hope, be always found amongst us the firmest *spirit of resistance*, superior to the united efforts of faction and ambition. For ambition, though it does not always take the lead of faction, will be sure in the end to make the most fatal advantage of it, and draw it to its own purposes. But, I trust our day of trial is yet far off; and there is *a fund of good sense in this country, which cannot long be deceived*, by the arts either of false reasoning or false patriotism.

LET-

LETTER XVII.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *August* 8, 1769.

THE gentleman, who has publiſhed an anſwer Sir William Meredith's pamphlet, having honoured me with a poſtſcript of ſix quarto pages, which he moderately calls, beſtowing *a very* few words upon me, I cannot, in common politeneſs, refuſe him a reply. The form and magnitude of a quarto impoſes upon the mind, and men who are unequal to the labour of diſcuſſing an intricate argument, or wiſh to avoid it, are willing enough to ſuppoſe, that much has been proved, becauſe much has been ſaid. Mine, I confeſs, are humble labours. I do not preſume to inſtruct the learned, but ſimply to inform the body of the people; and I prefer that channel of conveyance, which is likely to ſpread farthest among them. The advocates of the miniſtry ſeem to me to write for fame, and to flatter themſelves, that the ſize of their works will make them immortal. They pile up reluctant quarto upon ſolid folio, as if their labours, becauſe they are gigantic, could contend with truth and heaven.

The writer of the volume in queſtion meets me upon my own ground. He acknowledges there is no ſtatute, by which the ſpecific diſability we ſpeak of is created, but he affirms, that the cuſtom of parliament has been referred to, and that a caſe ſtrictly in point has been produced, with the deciſion of the court upon it.—I thank him for coming ſo fairly to

the

the point. He asserts, that the case of Mr. Walpole is strictly in point to prove that expulsion creates an absolute incapacity of being re-elected; and for this purpose he refers generally to the first vote of the house upon that occasion, without venturing to recite the vote itself. The unfair, disingenuous artifice of adopting that part of a precedent, which seems to suit his purpose, and omitting the remainder, deserves some pity, but cannot excite my resentment. He takes advantage eagerly of the first resolution, by which Mr. Walpole's incapacity is declared; and as to the two following, by which the candidate with the fewest votes was declared 'not duly elected,' and the election itself vacated, I dare say he would be well satisfied, if they were for ever blotted out of the journals of the house of commons. In fair argument, no part of a precedent should be admitted, unless the whole of it be given to us together. The author has divided his precedent, for he knew that, taken together, it produced a consequence directly the reverse of that which he endeavours to draw from a vote of expulsion. But what will this honest person say, if I take him at his word, and demonstrate to him, that the house of commons never meant to found Mr. Walpole's incapacity upon his expulsion only? What subterfuge will then remain?

Let it be remembered that we are speaking of the intention of men, who lived more than half a century ago, and that such intention can only be collected from their words and actions, as they are delivered to us upon record. To prove their designs by a supposition of what they would have done, opposed to what they actually did, is mere trifling and impertinence. The vote, by which Mr. Walpole's incapacity

capacity was declared, is thus expreſſed, 'That Robert Walpole, Eſq. having been this ſeſſion of parliament committed a priſoner to the Tower, and expelled this houſe for a breach of truſt in the execution of his office, and notorious corruption when a ſecretary at war, was and is incapable of being elected a member to ſerve in this preſent parliament*.' Now, Sir, to my underſtanding, no propoſition of this kind can be more evident, than that the houſe of commons, by this very vote, themſelves underſtood, and meant to declare, that Mr. Walpole's incapacity, aroſe from the crimes he had committed, not from the puniſhment the houſe annexed to them. The high breach of truſt, the notorious corruption are ſtated in the ſtrongeſt terms. They do not tell us he was incapable becauſe he was expelled, but becauſe he had been guilty of ſuch offences as juſtly rendered him unworthy of a ſeat in parliament. If they had intended to fix the diſability upon his expulſion alone, the mention of his crimes in the ſame vote would have been highly improper. It could only perplex the minds of the electors, who, if they collected any thing from ſo

* It is well worth remarking, that the compiler of a certain quarto, called *The caſe of the late election for the county of Middleſex conſidered*, has the impudence to recite this very vote, in the following terms, vide page 2. 'Reſolved, that Robert Walpole, Eſq. 'having been that ſeſſion of parliament expelled 'the houſe, was and is incapable of being elected a 'member to ſerve in the preſent parliament.' There cannot be a ſtronger poſitive proof of the treachery of the compiler, nor a ſtronger preſumptive proof that he was convinced that the vote, if truly recited, would overturn his whole argument.

confuſed a declaration of the law of parliament, muſt have concluded that their repreſentative had been declared incapable becauſe he was highly guilty, not becauſe he had been puniſhed. But even admitting them to have underſtood it in the other ſenſe, they muſt then, from the very terms of the vote, have united the idea of his being ſent to the Tower with that of his expulſion, and conſidered his incapacity as the joint effect of both.

I do not mean to give an opinion upon the injuſtice of the proceedings of the houſe of commons with regard to Mr. Walpole; but certainly, if I admitted their cenſure to be well founded, I could no way avoid agreeing with them in the conſequence they drew from it. I could never have a doubt, in law or reaſon, that a man, convicted of a high breach of truſt, and of a notorious corruption, in the execution of a public office, was and ought to be incapable of ſitting in the ſame parliament. Far from attempting to invalidate that vote, I ſhould have wiſhed that the incapacity declared by it could legally have been continued for ever.

Now, Sir, obſerve how forcibly the argument returns. The houſe of commons, upon the face of their proceedings, had the ſtrongeſt motives to declare Mr. Walpole incapable of being re-elected. They thought ſuch a man unworthy to ſit among them. To that point they proceeded no farther; for they reſpected the rights of the people, while they aſſerted their own. They did not infer, from Mr. Walpole's incapacity, that his opponent was duly elected; on the contrary they declared Mr. Taylor 'Not duly elected,' and the election itſelf void.

Such,

Such, however, is the precedent, which my honeſt friend aſſures us is ſtrictly in point to prove, that expulſion of itſelf creates an incapacity of being re-elected. If it had been ſo, the preſent houſe of commons ſhould at leaſt have followed ſtrictly the example before them, and ſhould have ſtated to us, in the ſame vote, the crimes for which they expelled Mr. Wilkes; whereas they reſolve ſimply, that, 'having been expelled, he was and is incapable.' In this proceeding I am authorized to affirm, they have neither ſtatute, nor cuſtom, nor reaſon, nor one ſingle precedent to ſupport them. On the other ſide, there is indeed a precedent ſo ſtrongly in point, that all the inchanted caſtles of miniſterial magic fall before it. In the year 1698, (a period which the rankeſt Tory dare not except againſt) Mr. Wollaſton was expelled, re-elected, and admitted to take his ſeat in the ſame parliament. The miniſtry have precluded themſelves from all objections drawn from the cauſe of his expulſion, for they affirm abſolutely, that expulſion of itſelf creates the diſability. Now, Sir, let ſophiſtry evade, let falſehood aſſert, and impudence deny——here ſtands the precedent, a land-mark to direct us through a troubled ſea of controverſy, conſpicuous and unremoved.

I have dwelt the longer upon the diſcuſſion of this point, becauſe in *my* opinion it comprehends the whole queſtion. The reſt is unworthy of notice. We are enquiring whether incapacity be or be not created by expulſion. In the caſes of Bedford and Malden, the incapacity of the perſons returned was created by act of parliament. But really, Sir, my honeſt friend's ſuppoſitions are as unfavourable to him as his facts. He well knows that the clergy,

beſides that they are repreſented in common with their fellow-ſubjects, have alſo a ſeparate parliament of their own?—that their incapacity to ſit in the houſe of commons has been confirmed by repeated deciſions of the houſe, and that the law of parliament, declared by thoſe deciſions, has been for above two centuries notorious and undiſputed. The author is certainly at liberty to fancy caſes, and make whatever compariſons he thinks proper; his ſuppoſitions ſtill continue as diſtant from fact, as his wild diſcourſes are from ſolid argument.

The concluſion of his book is candid to an extreme. He offers to grant me all I deſire. He thinks he may ſafely admit that the caſe of Mr. Walpole makes directly againſt him, for it ſeems he has one grand ſolution *in petto* for all difficulties. *If*, ſays he, *I were to allow all this, it will only prove, that the law of election was different, in queen Anne's time, from what it is at preſent.*

This indeed is more than I expected. The principle, I know, has been maintained in fact, but I never expected to ſee it ſo formally declared. What can he mean; does he aſſume this language to ſatisfy the doubts of the people, or does he mean to rouſe their indignation; are the miniſtry daring enough to affirm that the houſe of commons have a right to make and unmake the law of parliament, at their pleaſure?—Does the law of parliament, which we are ſo often told is the law of the land?—Does the common right of every ſubject of the realm depend upon an arbitrary, capricious vote of one branch of the legiſlature? The voice of truth and reaſon muſt be ſilent.

The

The miniſtry tell us plainly that this is no longer a queſtion of right, but of power and force alone. What was law yeſterday is it not law to-day: and now it ſeems we have no better rule to live by, than the temporary diſcretion and fluctuating integrity of the houſe of commons.

Profeſſions of patriotiſm are become ſtale and ridiculous. For my own part, I claim no merit from endeavouring to do a ſervice to my fellow ſubjects. I have done it to the beſt of my underſtanding; and without looking for the approbation of other men, my conſcience is ſatisfied. What remains to be done concerns the collective body of the people. They are now to determine for themſelves, whether they will firmly and conſtitutionally aſſert their rights; or make an humble ſlaviſh ſurrender of them at the feet of the miniſtry. To a generous mind there cannot be a doubt. We owe it to our anceſtors to preſerve entire thoſe rights, which they have delivered to our care; we owe it to our poſterity, not to ſuffer their deareſt inheritance to be deſtroyed. But if it were poſſible for us to be inſenſible of thoſe ſacred claims, there is yet an obligation binding upon ourſelves, from which nothing can acquit us,—a perſonal intereſt whch we cannot ſurrender. To alienate even our own rights, would be a crime as much more enormus than ſuicide, as a life of civil ſecurity and freedom is ſuperior to a bare exiſtence; and if life be the bounty of heaven, we ſcornfully reject the nobleſt part of the gift, if we conſent to ſurrender that certain rule of living, without which the condition of human nature is not only miſerable, but contemptible.

JUNIUS.

LETTER. XVIII.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *Aug.* 22, 1769.

I MUST beg of you to print a few lines, in explanation of ſome paſſages in my laſt letter, which I ſee have been miſunderſtood.

1. When I ſaid, that the houſe of commons never meant to found Mr. Walpole's incapacity on his expulſion *only*, I meant no more than to deny the general propoſition, that expulſion *alone* creates the incapacity. If there be any thing ambiguous in the expreſſion, I beg leave to explain it by ſaying, that, in my opinion, expulſion neither creates, nor in any part contributes to create the incapacity in queſtion.

2. I carefully avoided entering into the merits of Mr. Walpole's caſe. I did not enquire, whether the houſe of commons acted juſtly, or whether they truly declared the law of parliament. My remarks went only to their apparent meaning and intention, as it ſtands declared in their own reſolution.

3. I never meant to affirm, that a commitment to the Tower created a diſqualification. On the contrary, I conſidered that idea as an abſurdity into which the miniſtry muſt inevitably fall, if they reaſoned right upon their own principles.

The caſe of Mr. Wollaſton ſpeaks for itſelf. The miniſtry aſſert that expulſion alone creates an abſolute, complete incapacity to be re-elected to ſit in the

the ſame parliament. This propoſition they have uniformly maintained, without any condition or modification whatſoever. Mr. Wollaſton was expelled, re-elected, and admitted to take his ſeat in the ſame parliament.—I leave it to the public to determine, whether this be a plain matter of fact, or mere nonſenſe and declamation.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XIX.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *Sept.* 5, 1769.

AMIDST the great number of coreſpondents who have raiſed your paper to a ſuperiority over the reſt, I don't remember to have obſerved lately any of the female ſex. To a woman of ſpirit, the moſt intolerable of all grievances in a reſtraint on the liberty of the tongue. I can't bear to ſee the men have it all to themſelves; and ſhall certainly burſt, if I am not permitted to put in a word. Much has been ſaid of late about grievances and apprehenſions, inſtructions and petitions, elections and expulſions. Now, Sir, I want to enter the liſts with one of the moſt celebrated of your political correſpondents: Here I throw down my glove, and am in hopes it will be taken up by—Junius.

Some people perhaps may blame me for medling with politics, a ſcience fit only for men; but Junius has no right to find fault; for Junius has been the aggreſſor

aggreſſor by making ſuch frequent incurſions into ſcandal, the natural province of the women.

However, I will do your correſpondent Junius the juſtice to ſay, that I think him a very fine writer, a great maſter of compoſition, and indeed upon the whole I have not ſeen a prettier fellow—upon paper. His former letters have conſiſted of general declamation, or pointed perſonal abuſe. In both of theſe he has proved himſelf an adept. There is a great deal of oratory in his declamations, though he is perhaps too flowery and metaphorical, and ſeems as fond of point and antitheſis as any woman is of point lace and French ſilk. As to his perſonal attacks, they are irreſiſtible; no character can ſtand before him; he is the very butcher of a reputation: 'Heaven preſerve the characters of all my tribe from Junius!'

In the art of exaggeration he has no equal; molehills he magnifies into mountains, and views your *ſmalleſt peccadillo* through a double microſcope. Should there be the leaſt ſpot or ſpeck on your reputation, Junius can ſpread it out (with the help of a few drops of ink) till it covers you all over, and makes you as black as a fiend; in ſhort, Junius is chief japanner or calumniator-general to the oppoſition; he is employed to beſmear the miniſtry with his beſt liquid blacking; and when he has written them out of office, he will no doubt change his colours, take a different bruſh, and white waſh their ſucceſſors. I wiſh he may make as diſtinguiſhed a figure in the ſweet work of penegyric as he has done in the painful taſk of calumny and detraction!

But of all kinds of abuſe, private ſcandal ſeems to be his favourite morſel; Junius lays hold of a

ſcan-

ſcandalous anecdote, with as much keenneſs as a ſpider ſeizes an unfortunate fly; he crawls forth from the dark hole where he lay concealed; how eagerly he clutches it; with what a malicious pleaſure he drags it along; his eyes gloat upon it with cruel delight; he winds it round and round with his cobweb rhetoric, and ſucks the very heart's blood of family peace!

Various have been the conjectures formed on the queſtion, 'Who is this Junius?'—I have heard at leaſt twenty perſons named, whom ſuſpicion points the finger at; nay I have been aſſured at different times, that each of them was the author in queſtion. They could not *all* be the writer; perhaps *none* of them is.—But in ſpite of all the curioſity which is imputed to our ſex, I declare ſincerely, that I would not give a pin for the ſecret. 'Tis indifferent to me who the man is? and whether he was firſt dipped in the Thames or the Tweed, the Liffey or the Shannon.

But though I can't tell who Junius *is*, I will tell you what he is *like*. Junius is like a racer in the field of politics, who walks over the courſe alone; no one venturing to ſtart againſt him; I have for ſome time had a violent inclination to enter at the poſt, though I am ſenſible the odds at ſtarting would be greatly againſt the filly; but for all that, perhaps I ſhould be up with him at the long run. But I have run out my ſimile, and therefore muſt beg leave to take a freſh one. Your paper, Mr. Woodfall, is become the grand political cockpit; and Junius ſtruts about in it like a cock whom nobody can match; ſuppoſe that I were pitted againſt him, how do you think the bets would go? and what are the

odds

odds that he does not come off hen-pecked? If I ſhould happen to get the better of him, it would be as much a matter of public wonder as the late affair of the hen in Scotland-Yard, who 'attacked 'a prodigious large rat that was carrying off one 'of her chickens, and after fighting a conſiderable 'time, killed the rat, to the great joy and ſurprize 'of the ſpectators.' And how great will be the honour accruing to our ſex from ſuch a victory? it will be recorded amongſt the moſt famous exploits in the annals of female proweſs; and I ſhall be ranked with the moſt renowned heroines of antiquity, Thomyris and Semiramis, Judith and Deborah.

But perhaps the defeat of this political Holofernes may not be ſo very difficult; and indeed on a nearer view he does not appear half ſo formidable. When Junius ſtalked upon the heights of declamation, he appeared of more than ordinary ſize; but now that he has deſcended to the plain ground of reaſon and argument, he appears nearly on a level with common men. His letters on the Middleſex election are moſt ſophiſtically dull, unleſs where he throws in ſome perſonalities by way of giving ſpirit and flavour to his political olio. However, I don't believe that with all his ſophiſtry he has made a ſingle convert to his opinion. I fancy there is hardly one cool, moderate impartial perſon in England, who does not think that the houſe of commons are the *only* judges of their own privileges; that no power on earth can force a member upon them, whom they have declared incapable of being elected; and that if any perſon under ſuch known and declared incapacity, happens to have the greateſt number of votes,

votes, that candidate who has the next greateſt number of legal votes, muſt of courſe be the ſitting member. This opinion ſeems to me to be perfectly agreeable to reaſon, to common ſenſe, and the principles of the conſtitution, and (notwithſtanding the deluſive appearance of petitions obtained we all know how) I do verily believe it is the opinion of every candid, impartial, unprejudiced perſon in England; in ſhort, of all thoſe who are not tools of faction, or the dupes of party.

JUNIA.

LETTER XX.

TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *September* 21, 1769.

I FIND myſelf unexpectedly married in the newspapers, without my knowledge or conſent. Since I am fated to be a huſband, I hope at leaſt the lady will perform the principal duty of a wife. Marriages, they ſay, are made in heaven, but they are conſummated upon earth; and ſince Junia has adopted my name, ſhe cannot, in common matrimonial decency, refuſe to make me a tender of her perſon. Politics are too barren a ſubject for a newmarried couple. I ſhould be glad to furniſh her with one more fit for a lady to handle, and better ſuited to the dexterity of her ſex. In ſhort, if Junia be young and handſome, ſhe will have no reaſon to complain of my method of conducting an argument. I abominate all tergiverſation in diſcourſe, and ſhe may be aſſured that whatever I advance, whether it be weak or forcible, ſhall at any rate, be directly in point.

odds that he does not come off hen-pecked? If I ſhould happen to get the better of him, it would be as much a matter of public wonder as the late affair of the hen in Scotland-Yard, who 'attacked 'a prodigious large rat that was carrying off one 'of her chickens, and after fighting a conſiderable 'time, killed the rat, to the great joy and ſurprize 'of the ſpectators.' And how great will be the honour accruing to our ſex from ſuch a victory? it will be recorded amongſt the moſt famous exploits in the annals of female proweſs; and I ſhall be ranked with the moſt renowned heroines of antiquity, Thomyris and Semiramis, Judith and Deborah.

But perhaps the defeat of this political Holofernes may not be ſo very difficult; and indeed on a nearer view he does not appear half ſo formidable. When Junius ſtalked upon the heights of declamation, he appeared of more than ordinary ſize; but now that he has deſcended to the plain ground of reaſon and argument, he appears nearly on a level with common men. His letters on the Middleſex election are moſt ſophiſtically dull, unleſs where he throws in ſome perſonalities by way of giving ſpirit and flavour to his political olio. However, I don't believe that with all his ſophiſtry he has made a ſingle convert to his opinion. I fancy there is hardly one cool, moderate impartial perſon in England, who does not think that the houſe of commons are the *only* judges of their own privileges; that no power on earth can force a member upon them, whom they have declared incapable of being elected; and that if any perſon under ſuch known and declared incapacity, happens to have the greateſt number of votes,

votes, that candidate who has the next greateſt number of legal votes, muſt of courſe be the ſitting member. This opinion ſeems to me to be perfectly agreeable to reaſon, to common ſenſe, and the principles of the conſtitution, and (notwithſtanding the deluſive appearance of petitions obtained we all know how) I do verily believe it is the opinion of every candid, impartial, unprejudiced perſon in England; in ſhort, of all thoſe who are not tools of faction, or the dupes of party.

JUNIA.

LETTER XX.

TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *September* 21, 1769.

I FIND myſelf unexpectedly married in the newspapers, without my knowledge or conſent. Since I am fated to be a huſband, I hope at leaſt the lady will perform the principal duty of a wife. Marriages, they ſay, are made in heaven, but they are conſummated upon earth; and ſince Junia has adopted my name, ſhe cannot, in common matrimonial decency, refuſe to make me a tender of her perſon. Politics are too barren a ſubject for a newmarried couple. I ſhould be glad to furniſh her with one more fit for a lady to handle, and better ſuited to the dexterity of her ſex. In ſhort, if Junia be young and handſome, ſhe will have no reaſon to complain of my method of conducting an argument. I abominate all tergiverſation in diſcourſe, and ſhe may be aſſured that whatever I advance, whether it be weak or forcible, ſhall at any rate, be directly in point.

point. It is true I am a ſtrenuous advocate for liberty and property, but when theſe rights are invaded by a pretty woman, I am neither able to defend my money nor my freedom; the divine right of beauty is the only one an Engliſhman ought to acknowledge, and a pretty woman the only tyrant he is not authoriſed to reſiſt.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXI.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF BEDFORD.

MY LORD, *Sept.* 19, 1769.

YOU are ſo little accuſtomed to receive any marks of reſpect or eſteem from the public, that if, in the following lines, a compliment or expreſſion of applauſe ſhould eſcape me, I fear you would conſider it as a mockery of your eſtabliſhed character, and perhaps an inſult to your underſtanding. You have nice feelings, my Lord, if we may judge from your reſentments. Cautious therefore of giving offence, where you have ſo little deſerved it, I ſhall leave the illuſtration of your virtues to other hands. Your friends have a privilege to play upon the eaſineſs of your temper, or poſſibly they are better acquainted with your good qualities than I am. You have done good by ſtealth. The reſt is upon record. You have ſtill left ample room for ſpeculation, when panegyric is exhauſted.

You are indeed a very conſiderable man. The higheſt rank;—a ſplendid fortune; and a name, glorious till it was yours, were ſufficient to have ſup-

ſupported you with meaner abilities than I think you poſſeſs. From the firſt, you derived a conſtitutional claim to reſpect; from the ſecond, a natural extenſive authority;—the laſt created a partial expectation of hereditary virtues. The uſe you have made of theſe uncommon advantages, might have been more honourable to yourſelf, but could not be more inſtructive to mankind. We may trace it in the veneration of your country, the choice of your friends, and in the accompliſhment of every ſanguine hope, which the public might have conceived from the illuſtrious name of Ruſſel.

The eminence of your ſtation gave you a commanding proſpect of your duty. The road, which led to honour, was open to your view. You could not loſe it by miſtake, and you had no temptation to depart from it by deſign. Compare the natural dignity and importance of the richeſt peer in England;—the noble independance, which he might have maintained in parliament; and the real intereſt and reſpect, which he might have acquired, not only in parliament, but through the whole kingdom; compare theſe glorious diſtinctions with the ambition of holding a ſhare in government, the emoluments of a place, the ſale of a borough, or the purchaſe of a corporation; and though you may not regret the virtues, which create reſpect, you may ſee with anguiſh, how much real importance and authority you have loſt. Conſider the character of an independant virtuous Duke of Bedford; imagine what he might be in this country, then reflect one moment upon what you are. If it be poſſible for me to withdraw my attention from the fact, I will tell you in theory what ſuch a man might be.

Conſcious of his own weight and importance, his conduct in parliament would be directed by nothing but the conſtitutional duty of a peer. He would conſider himſelf as a guardian of the laws. Willing to ſupport the juſt meaſures of government, but determined to obſerve the conduct of the miniſter with ſuſpicion, he would oppoſe the violence of faction with as much firmneſs, as the encroachments of prerogative. He would be as little capable of bargaining with the miniſter for places for himſelf, or his dependants, as of deſcending to mix himſelf in the intrigues of oppoſition. Whenever an important queſtion called for his opinion in parliament, he would be heard, by the moſt profligate miniſter, with deference and reſpect. His authority would either ſanctify or diſgrace the meaſures of government.—The people would look up to him as to their protector, and a virtuous prince would have one honeſt man in his dominions, in whoſe integrity and judgment he might ſafely confide. If it ſhould be the will of providence to afflict him with a domeſtic misfortune, he would ſubmit to the ſtroke, with feeling, but not without dignity. He would conſider the people as his children, and receive a generous heart-felt conſolation, in the ſympathiſing tears, and bleſſings of his country.

Your Grace may probably diſcover ſomething more intelligible in the negative part of this illuſtrious character. The man I have deſcribed would never proſtitute his dignity in parliament by an indecent violence, either in oppoſing or defending a miniſter. He would not at one moment rancorouſly perſecute, at another baſely cringe to the favourite of his Sovereign. After outraging the roy-

al

al dignity with peremptory conditions, little ſhort of menace and hoſtility, he would never deſcend to the humility of ſoliciting an interview with the Favourite, and of offering to recover, at any price, the honour of his friendſhip. Though deceived perhaps in his youth, he would not, through the courſe of a long life, have invariably choſen his friends from among the moſt profligate of mankind. His own honour would have forbidden him from mixing his private pleaſures or converſation with jockeys, gameſters, blaſphemers, gladiators, or buffoons. He would then have never felt, much leſs would he have ſubmitted to the humiliating diſhoneſt neceſſity of engaging in the intereſts and intrigues of his dependants, of ſupplying their vices, or relieving their beggary, at the expence of his country. He would not have betrayed ſuch ignorance, or ſuch contempt of the conſtitution, as openly to avow, in a court of juſtice, the purchaſe and ſale of a borough. He would not have thought it conſiſtent with his rank in the ſtate, or even with his perſonal importance, to be the little tyrant of a little corporation. He would never have been inſulted with virtues which he had laboured to extinguiſh, nor ſuffered the diſgrace of a mortifying defeat, which has made him ridiculous and contemptible, even to the few by whom he was not deteſted. I reverence the afflictions of a good man—his ſorrows are ſacred. But how can we take part in the diſtreſſes of a man, whom we can neither love nor eſteem; or feel for a calamity, of which he himſelf is inſenſible? Where was the father's heart, when he could look for, or find an immediate conſolation for the loſs of an only ſon, in conſultations and bargains

ſor a place at court, and even in the miſery of balloting at the India Houſe!

Admitting then that you have miſtaken or deſerted thoſe honourable principles, which ought to hvae directed your conduct; admitting that you have as little claim to private affection as to public eſteem, let us ſee with what abilities, with what degree of judgment you have carried your own ſyſtem into execution. A great man, in the ſucceſs, and even in the magnitude of his crimes, finds a reſcue from contempt. Your Grace is every way unfortunate. Yet I will not look back to thoſe ridiculous ſcenes, by which in your earlier days, you thought it an honour to be diſtinguiſhed; the recorded ſtripes, the public infamy, your own ſufferings, or Mr. Rigby's fortitude. Theſe events undoubtedly left an impreſſion, though not upon your mind. To ſuch a mind, it may perhaps be a pleaſure to reflect, that there is hardly a corner of any of his Majeſty's kingdoms, except France, in which, at one time or other, your valuable life has not been in danger. Amiable man! we ſee and acknowledge the protection of providence, by which you have ſo often eſcaped the perſonal deteſtation of your fellow ſubjects, and are ſtill reſerved for the public juſtice of your country.

Your hiſtory begins to be important at that auſpicious period, at which you were deputed to repreſent the Earl of Bute, at the court of Verſailles. It was an honourable office, and executed with the ſame ſpirit with which it was accepted. Your patrons wanted an ambaſſador, who would ſubmit to make conceſſions, without daring to inſiſt upon any honourable condition for his Sovereign. Their buſineſs

ſineſs required a man who had as little feeling for his own dignity as for the welfare of his country; and they found him in the firſt rank of the nobility. Belleiſle, Goree, Gaudaloupe, St. Lucia, Martinique, the Fiſhery, and the Havana, are glorious monuments of your Grace's talents for negociation. My Lord, we are too well acquainted with your pecuniary character, to think it poſſible that ſo many public ſacrifices ſhould have been made, without ſome private compenſations. Your conduct carries with it an interior evidence, beyond all the legal proof of a court of juſtice. Even the callous pride of Lord Egremont was alarmed. He ſaw and felt his own diſhonour in correſponding with you; and there certainly was a moment, at which he meant to have reſiſted, had not a fatal lethargy prevailed over his faculties, and carried all ſenſe and memory away with it.

I will not pretend to ſpecify the ſecret terms on which you were invited to ſupport an adminiſtration which Lord Bute pretended to leave in full poſſeſſion of their miniſterial authority, and perfectly maſters of themſelves. He was not of a temper to relinquiſh power, tho' he retired from employment. Stipulations were certainly made between your Grace and him, and certainly violated. After two years ſubmiſſion, you thought you had collected a ſtrength ſufficient to controul his influence, and that it was your turn to be a tyrant, becauſe you had been a ſlave. When you found yourſelf miſtaken in your opinion of your gracious Maſter's firmneſs, diſappointment got the better of all your humble diſcretion, and carried you to an exceſs of outrage to his perſon, as diſtant from true ſpirit, as from all

cency and reſpect. After robbing him him of the rights of a King, you would not permit him to preſerve the honour of a Gentleman. It was then Lord Weymouth was nominated to Ireland, and diſpatched (we well remember with what indecent hurry) to plunder the treaſury of the firſt fruits of an employment which you well knew he was never to execute.

This ſudden declaration of war againſt the Favourite might have given you a momentary merit with the public, if it had either been adopted upon principle, or maintained with reſolution. Without looking back to all your former ſervility, we need only obſerve your ſubſequent conduct, to ſee upon what motives you acted. Apparently united with Mr. Grenville, you waited until Lord Rockingham's feeble adminiſtration ſhould diſſolve in its own weakneſs.—The moment their diſmiſſion was ſuſpected, the moment you perceived that another ſyſtem was adopted in the cloſet, you thought it no diſgrace to return to your former dependance, and ſolicit once more the friendſhip of Lord Bute. You begged an interview, at which he had ſpirit enough to treat you with contempt.

It would now be of little uſe to point out by what a train of weak, injudicious meaſures, it became neceſſary, or was thought ſo, to call you back to a ſhare in the adminiſtration. The friends, whom you did not in the laſt inſtance deſert, were not of a character to add ſtrength or credit to government; and at that time your alliance with the Duke of Grafton was, I preſume, hardly foreſeen. We muſt look for other ſtipulations, to account for that ſudden reſolution of the cloſet, by which three of

your

dependants (whoſe characters, I think, cannot be leſs reſpected than they are) were advanced to offices, through which you might again controul the miniſter, and probably engroſs the whole direction of affairs.

The poſſeſſion of abſolute power is now once more within your reach. The meaſures you have taken to obtain and confirm it, are too groſs to eſcape the eyes of a diſcerning judicious prince. His palace is beſieged; the lines of circumvallation are drawing round him; and unleſs he finds a reſource in his own activity, or in the attachment of the real friends of his family, the beſt of princes muſt ſubmit to the confinement of a ſtate priſoner, until your Grace's death, or ſome leſs fortunate event ſhall raiſe the ſiege. For the preſent, you may ſafely reſume that ſtyle of inſult and menace, which even a private gentleman cannot ſubmit to hear without being contemptible. Mr. Mackenzie's hiſtory is not yet forgotten, and you may find precedents enough of the mode in which an imperious ſubject may ſignify his pleaſure to his Sovereign. Where will this gracious monarch look for aſſiſtance, when the wretched Grafton could forget his obligations to his maſter, and deſert him for a hollow alliance with *ſuch* a man as the Duke of Bedford.

Let us conſider you, then, as arrived at the ſummit of a worldly greatneſs: let us ſuppoſe, that all your plans of avarice and ambition are accompliſhed, and your moſt ſanguine wiſhes gratified in the fear, as well as the hatred of the people: Can age itſelf forget that you are now in the laſt act of life? Can grey hairs make folly venerable? And is there no period to be reſerved for meditation and retirement?

ment? For ſhame! my Lord: Let it not be recorded of you, that the lateſt moments of your life were dedicated to the ſame unworthy purſuits, the ſame buſy agitations, in which your youth and manhood were exhauſted. Conſider, that, although you cannot diſgrace your former life, you are violating the character of age, and expoſing the impotent imbecility, after you have loſt the vigour of the paſſions.

Your friends will aſk, perhaps, Whither ſhall this unhappy old man retire? Can he remain in the metropolis, where his life has been ſo often threatened, and his palace ſo often attacked? If he returns to Wooburn, ſcorn and mockery await him. He muſt create a ſolitude round his eſtate if he would avoid the face of reproach and deriſion. At Plymouth, his deſtruction would be more than probable; at Exeter, inevitable. No honeſt Engliſhman will ever forget his attachment, nor any honeſt Scotchman forgive his treachery to Lord Bute. At every town he enters, he muſt change his liveries and his name. Which ever way he flies, the *Hue and Cry* of the country purſues him.

In another kingdom indeed, the bleſſings of his adminiſtration have been more ſenſibly felt;—his virtues better underſtood;—or at worſt, they will not, for him alone, forget their hoſpitality.—As well might VERRES have returned to Sicily. You twice eſcaped, my Lord; beware of a third experiment. The indignation of a whole people, plundered, inſulted, and oppreſſed as they have been, will not always be diſappointed.

It is in vain therefore to ſhift the ſcene. You can no more fly from your enemies than from yourſelf. Perſecuted abroad, you look into your own heart;

heart for conſolation, and find nothing but reproaches and deſpair. But, my Lord, you may quit the field of buſineſs, though not the field of danger; and though you cannot be ſafe, you may ceaſe to be ridiculous. I fear you have liſtened too long to the advice of thoſe pernicious friends, with whoſe intereſts you have ſordidly united your own, and for whom you have ſacrificed every thing that ought to be dear to a man of honour. They are ſtill baſe enough to encourage the follies of your age, as they once did the vices of your youth. As little acquainted with the rules of decorum, as with the laws of morality, they will not ſuffer you to profit by experience, nor even to conſult the propriety of a bad character. Even now they tell you, that life is no more than a dramatic ſcene, in which the hero ſhould preſerve his conſiſtency to the laſt, and that as you lived without virtue, you ſhould die without repentance.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXII.

A LETTER OF SIR WILLIAM DRAPER TO JUNIUS.

SIR, *Sept.* 20, 1769.

HAVING accidentally ſeen a *republication* of your letters, wherein you have been pleaſed to *aſſert*, that I had *ſold* the companions of my ſucceſs; I am again obliged to declare the ſaid aſſertion to be a moſt *infamous* and *malicious falſehood*; and I *again* call upon you to ſtand forth, avow yourſelf, and *prove* the charge. If you can make it out to the ſatisfaction

tisfaction of any one man in the kingdom, I will be content to be thought the worſt man in it; if you do not, what muſt the nation think of you? *Party* has nothing to do in this affair: You have made a perſonal attack upon my honour, defamed me by a moſt vile calumny, which might poſſibly have ſunk into oblivion, had not ſuch uncommon pains been taken to renew and perpetuate this ſcandal, chiefly becauſe it has been told in good language: For I give you full credit for your elegant diction, well turned periods and attic wit; but wit is often times falſe, though it may appear brilliant; which is exactly the caſe of your *whole performance*. But, Sir, I am obliged in the moſt *ſerious* manner to accuſe you of being guilty of *falſities*. You have ſaid the thing that is *not*. To ſupport your ſtory, you have recourſe to the following *irreſiſtible* argument: 'You *ſold* the companions of your victory, becauſe 'when the ſixteenth regiment was given to *you*, you 'was *ſilent*.' The concluſion is inevitable. I believe that ſuch *deep* and *acute reaſoning* could only come from ſuch an extraordinary writer as *Junius*. But unfortunately for you, the *premiſes* as well as the *concluſion* are abſolutely *falſe*. Many applications have been made to the miniſtry on the ſubject of the Manilla ranſom *ſince* the time of my being colonel of that regiment. As I have for ſome years quitted London, I was obliged to have recourſe to the honourable colonel Manſon and Sir Samuel Corniſh to *negociate* for me: In the laſt autumn I perſonally delivered a memorial to the Earl of Shelburne at his ſeat in Wiltſhire. As you have told us of your importance, that you are a perſon of *rank* and *fortune*, and above a *common* bribe,

bribe, you may in all probability be not *unknown* to his lordſhip, who can ſatisfy you of the truth of what I ſay. But I ſhall now take the liberty, Sir, to ſeize your battery, and turn it againſt yourſelf. If your puerile and tinſel logic could carry the leaſt weight or conviction with it, how muſt *you* ſtand affected by the *inevitable concluſion*, as you are pleaſed to term it? According to *Junius*, *Silence* is *Guilt*. In many of the public papers, you have been called in the moſt direct and offenſive terms a *liar* and a *coward*. When you did reply to theſe foul accuſations? You have been quite *ſilent*; quite chop-fallen: Therefore, *becauſe* you was *ſilent*, the nation has a right to pronounce you to be both a liar and a coward from your own argument: But, Sir, I will give you fair play: will afford you an opportunity to wipe off the firſt appellation; by deſiring the proofs of your charge againſt me. Produce them! To wipe off the laſt produce *yourſelf*. People cannot bear any longer your *lion's ſkin*, and the deſpicable *impoſture* of the *old Roman name* which you have *affected*. For the future aſſume the name of ſome *modern* bravo and dark aſſaſſin: Let your appellation have ſome affinity to your practice. But if I muſt *periſh*, *Junius*, let me *periſh* in the face of day; be for *once* a generous and open enemy. I allow that gothic *appeals* to cold iron are no better proofs of a man's honeſty and veracity, than hot iron and burning plough-ſhares are of *female chaſtity*: But a ſoldier's honour is as delicate as a woman's; it muſt not be ſuſpected; you have dared to throw more than a ſuſpicion upon mine: You cannot but know the conſequences, which even the meek-

meekneſs of Chriſtianity would pardon me for, after the injury you have done me.

WILLIAM DRAPER.

LETTER XXIII.

Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.

TO SIR WILLIAM DRAPER KNIGHT OF THE BATH.

SIR, *Sept.* 25, 1769.

AFTER ſo long an interval, I did not expect to ſee the debate revived between us. My anſwer to your laſt letter ſhall be ſhort; for I write to you with reluctance, and I hope we ſhall now conclude our correſpondence for ever.

Had you been originally, and without provocation attacked by an anonymous writer, you would have ſome right to demand his name. But in this cauſe you are a volunteer. You engaged in it with the unpremeditated gallantry of a ſoldier. You were content to ſet your name in oppoſition to a man, who would probably continue in concealment. You underſtood the terms upon which we were to correſpond, and gave at leaſt a tacit aſſent to them. After voluntarily attacking me under the character of Junius, what poſſible right have you to know me under any other? Will you forgive me if I inſinuate to you, that you foreſaw ſome honour in the apparent ſpirit of coming forward in perſon, and that you were not quite indifferent to the diſplay of your literary qualifications?

You

You cannot but know that the republication of my letters was no more than a catchpenny contrivance of a printer, in which it was impoſſible I ſhould be concerned, and for which I am no way anſwerable. At the ſame time I wiſh you to underſtand, that if I do not take the trouble of reprinting theſe papers, it is not from any fear of giving offence to Sir William Draper.

Your remarks upon a ſignature, adopted merely for diſtinction, are unworthy of notice; but when you tell me I have ſubmitted to be called a liar and a coward, I muſt aſk you in my turn, whether you ſeriouſly think it any way incumbent upon me to take notice of the ſilly invectives of every ſimpleton, who writes in a news-paper; and what opinion you would have conceived of my diſcretion, had I ſuffered myſelf to be the dupe of ſo ſhallow an artifice?

Your appeal to the ſword, though conſiſtent enough with your late profeſſion, will neither prove your innocence nor clear you from ſuſpicion.—Your complaints with regard to the Manilla ranſom were, for a conſiderable time, a diſtreſs to government. You were appointed (greatly out of your turn) to the command of a regiment, and *during that adminiſtration* we heard no more of Sir William Draper. The facts, of which I ſpeak, may indeed be variouſly accounted for, but they are too notorious to be denied; and, I think, you might have learnt at the univerſity, that a falſe concluſion is an error in argument, not a breach of veracity. Your ſolicitations, I doubt not, were renewed under *another* adminiſtration. Admitting the fact, I fear an indifferent perſon would only infer from it, that experience had

made you acquainted with the benefits of complaining. Remember, Sir, that you have yourself confeſſed, that, *conſidering the critical ſituation of this country the miniſtry are in the right to temporize with Spain.* This confeſſion reduces you to an unfortunate dilemma. By renewing your ſolicitations, you muſt either mean to force your country into a war at a moſt unſeaſonable juncture; or having no view or expectation of that kind, that you look for nothing but a private compenſation to yourſelf.

As to me, it is by no means neceſſary that I ſhould be expoſed to the reſentment of the worſt and the moſt powerful men in this country, though I may be indifferent about yours. Though *you* would fight, there are others who would aſſaſſinate.

But after all, Sir, where is the injury? You aſſure me, that my logic is puerile and tinſel, that it carries not the leaſt weight or conviction, that my premiſes are falſe, and my concluſion abſurd. If this be a juſt deſcription of me, how is it poſſible for ſuch a writer to diſturb your peace of mind, or injure a character ſo well eſtabliſhed as yours? Take care, Sir William, how you indulge this unruly temper, leſt the world ſhould ſuſpect that conſcience has ſome ſhare in your reſentments. You have more to fear from the treachery of your own paſſions, than from any malevolence of mine.

I believe, Sir, you will never know me. A conſiderable time muſt certainly elapſe before we are perſonally acquainted. You need not, however, regret the delay, or ſuffer an apprehenſion that any length of time can reſtore you to the Chriſtian meek-

meekneſs of your temper, and diſappoint your preſent indignation. If I underſtand your character, there is in your own breaſt a repoſitory, in which your reſentments may be ſafely laid up for future occaſions, and preſerved without the hazard of diminution. The *Odia in longum jaciens, quæ reconderet, auctaque promeret*, I thought had only belonged to the worſt character of antiquity. The text is in Tacitus;—you know beſt where to look for the commentary.

JUNIUS.

LETTER. XXIV.

A WORD AT PARTING FROM SIR WILLIAM DRAPER TO JUNIUS.

SIR, *October* 7, 1769.

AS you have not favoured me with either of the *explanations* demanded of you, I can have nothing more to ſay to you upon my *own* account. Your mercy to me, or tenderneſs for yourſelf, has been very great. The public will judge of your *motives*. If your exceſs of modeſty forbids you to produce either the proofs, or yourſelf, I will excuſe it. Take courage; I have not the temper of Tiberius, any more than the rank or power. You, indeed, are a tyrant of another ſort, and upon your political bed of torture can excruciate any ſubject, from a firſt miniſter down to ſuch a grub or butterfly as myſelf; like another deteſted tyrant of antiquity, can make the wretched ſufferer fit the bed, if the bed will not fit the ſufferer, by diſjointing or

tearing the trembling limbs until they are ſtretched to its extremity. But courage, conſtancy, and patience, under torments, have ſometimes cauſed the moſt hardened monſters to relent, and forgive the object of their cruelty. You, Sir, are determined to try all that human nature can endure, until ſhe expires: elſe, was it poſſible that you could be the author of that moſt inhuman letter to the Duke of Bedford? I have read it with aſtoniſhment and horror; where, Sir? where were the feelings of your own heart, when you could upbraid a moſt affectionate father with the loſs of his only and moſt amiable ſon? Read over again thoſe cruel lines of yours, and let them wring your very ſoul! Cannot political queſtions be diſcuſſed without deſcending to the moſt odious perſonalities? Muſt you go wantonly out of your way to torment declining age, becauſe the Duke of Bedford may have quarrelled with thoſe whoſe cauſe and politics you eſpouſe? For ſhame! for ſhame! As you have *ſpoke daggers* to him, you may juſtly dread the *uſe* of them againſt your own breaſt, did a want of courage, or of noble ſentiments, ſtimulate him to ſuch mean revenge. He is above it; he is brave. Do you fancy that your own baſe arts have infected our whole iſland? But your own reflections, your own conſcience, muſt and will, if you have any ſpark of humanity remaining, give him moſt ample vengeance. Not all the power of words, with which you are ſo graced, will ever waſh out, or even palliate this foul blot in your character. I have not time at preſent to diſſect your letter ſo minutely as I could wiſh, but I will be bold enough to ſay, that it is (as to reaſon and argument) the moſt extraordinary

piece

piece of *florid impotence* that was ever impoſed upon the eyes and ears of the too credulous and deluded mob. It accuſes the Duke of Bedford of high treaſon. Upon what foundation? You tell us, 'That 'the Duke's *pecuniary character* makes it more than 'probable, and that he could not have made ſuch ſa'crifices at the peace, without *ſome private compen'ſations*; that his conduct carried with it an interi'or evidence, beyond all the legal proofs of a court 'of juſtice'.

My academical education, Sir, bids me tell you that it is neceſſary to eſtabliſh the truth of your firſt propoſition, before you preſume to draw inferences from it. Firſt prove the avarice, before you make the raſh, haſty, and moſt wicked concluſion. This father, *Junius*, whom you call avaricious, allowed that ſon eight thouſand pounds a year. Upon his moſt unfortunate death, which your uſual good-nature took care to remind him of, he greatly increaſed the jointure of the afflicted lady, his widow. Is this avarice? Is this doing good by *ſtealth*? It is upon record.

If exact order, method, and true œconomy as a maſter of a family; if ſplendor and juſt magnificence, without wild waſte and thoughtleſs extravagance, may conſtitute the character of an avaricious man, the duke is guilty. But for a moment let us admit that an ambaſſador may love money too much; what proof do you give that he has taken any to betray his country? Is it hereſay; or the evidence of letters, or ocular: or the evidence of thoſe concerned in this black affair? Produce your authorities to the public. It is a moſt impudent kind of ſorcery to attempt to blind us with the ſmoak, without

convincing us that the fire has exiſted. You firſt brand him with a vice that he is free from, to render him odious and ſuſpected. Suſpicion is the foul weapon with which you make all you chief attacks; with that you ſtab. But ſhall one of the firſt ſubjects of the realm be ruined in his fame; ſhall even his life be in conſtant danger, from a charge built upon ſuch ſandy foundations? Muſt his houſe be beſieged by lawleſs ruffians, his journies impeded, and even the aſylum of an alter be inſecure from aſſertions ſo baſe and falſe? Potent as he is, the duke is amenable to juſtice; if guilty, puniſhable. The parliament is the high and ſolemn tribunal for matters of ſuch great moment. To that be they ſubmitted. But I hope alſo that ſome notice will be taken of, and ſome puniſhment inflicted upon, falſe accuſers, eſpecially upon ſuch, *Junius*, who are *wilfully falſe*. In any truth I will agree, even with *Junius*; will agree with him that it is highly unbecoming the dignity of Peers to tamper with boroughs. Ariſtocracy is as fatal as democracy. Our conſtitution admits of neither. It loves a King, Lords, and commons really choſen by the unbought ſuffrages of a free people. But if corruption only ſhifts hands; if the wealthy Commoner gives the bribe, inſtead of the potent Peer, is the ſtate better ſerved by this exchange? Is the real emancipation of the borough effected, becauſe new parchment bonds may poſſibly ſuperſede the old? To ſay the truth, wherever ſuch practices prevail, they are equally criminal to and deſtructive of our freedom.

The reſt of your declamation is ſcarce worth conſidering, excepting for the elegance of the language.

guage. Like Hamlet in the play, you produce two pictures; you tell us, that one is not like the Duke of Bedford; then you bring a moſt hideous caricatura, and tell us of the reſemblance; but *multum abludit imago.*

All your long tedious accounts of the miniſterial quarrels, and the intrigues of the cabinet, are reducible to a few ſhort lines; and to convince you, Sir, that I do not mean to flatter any miniſter, either paſt or preſent, theſe are my thoughts: they ſeem to have acted like lovers, or children; have pouted, quarrelled, cried, kiſſed, and been friends again, as the objects of deſire, the miniſterial rattles, have been put into their hands. But ſuch proceedings are very unworthy of the gravity and dignity of a great nation. We do not want men of abilities; but we have wanted ſteadineſs: we want unanimity: your letters, *Junius*, will not contribute thereto. You may one day expire by a flame of your own kindling. But it is my humble opinion that lenity and moderation, pardon and oblivion, will diſappoint the efforts of all the ſeditious in the land, and extinguiſh their wide ſpreading fires. I have lived with this ſentiment: with this I ſhall die.

WILLIAM DRAPER.

LET-

LETTER XXV.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *Oct.* 13, 1769.

IF Sir William Draper's bed be a bed of tortures, he has made it for himſelf. I ſhall never interrupt his repoſe. Having changed the ſubject, there are parts of his laſt letter not undeſerving of a reply. Leaving his private character and conduct out of the queſtion, I ſhall conſider him merely in the capacity of an author, whoſe labours certainly do no diſcredit to a news-paper.

We ſay, in common diſcourſe, that a man may be his own enemy, and the frequency of the fact makes the expreſſion intelligible. But that a man ſhould be the bittereſt enemy of his friends, implies a contradiction of a peculiar nature. There is ſomething in it, which cannot be conceived without a confuſion of ideas, nor expreſſed without a ſoleciſm in language. Sir William Draper is ſtill that fatal friend Lord Granby found him. Yet I am ready to do juſtice to his generoſity; if indeed it be not ſomething more than generous, to be the voluntary advocate of men, who think themſelves injured by his aſſiſtance, and to conſider nothing in the cauſe he adopts, but the difficulty of defending it. I thought however he had been better read in the hiſtory of the human heart, than to compare or confound the tortures of the body with thoſe of the mind. He ought to have known, though perhaps it might not be his intereſt to con-

confeſs, that no outward tyranny can reach the mind. If conſcience plays the tyrant, it would be greatly for the benefit of the world, that ſhe were more arbitrary, and far leſs placable, than ſome men find her.

But it ſeems I have outraged the feelings of a father's heart.—Am I indeed ſo injudicious? Does Sir William Draper think I would have hazarded my credit with a generous nation, by ſo groſs a violation of the laws of humanity? Does he think I am ſo little acquainted with the firſt and nobleſt characteriſtic of Engliſhmen? Or how will he reconcile ſuch folly with an underſtanding ſo full of artifice as mine? Had he been a father, he would have been but little offended with the ſeverity of the reproach, for his mind would have been filled with the juſtice of it. He would have ſeen that I did not inſult the feelings of a father, but the father who felt nothing. He would have truſted to the evidence of his own paternal heart, and boldly denied the poſſibility of the fact, inſtead of defending it. Againſt whom then will his honeſt indignation be directed, when I aſſure him, that this whole town beheld the Duke of Bedford's conduct, upon the death of his ſon, with horror and aſtoniſhment. Sir William Draper does himſelf but little honour in oppoſing the general ſenſe of his country. The people are ſeldom wrong in their opinions,—in their ſentiments they are never miſtaken. There may be a vanity perhaps in a ſingular way of thinking:—but when a man profeſſes a want of thoſe feelings, which do honour to the multitude, he hazards ſomething infinitely more important than the character of his underſtanding. After all, as Sir

William

William may poſſibly be in earneſt in his anxiety for the duke of Bedford, I ſhould be glad to relieve him from it. He may reſt aſſured that this worthy nobleman laughs, with equal indifference, at my reproaches, and Sir William's diſtreſs about him. But here let it ſtop. Even the Duke of Bedford, inſenſible as he is, will conſult the tranquillity of his life in not provoking the moderation of my temper. If, from the profoundeſt contempt, I ſhould ever riſe into anger, he ſhould ſoon find, that all I have already ſaid of him was lenity and compaſſion.

Out of a long catalogue, Sir William Draper has confined himſelf to the refutation of two charges only. The reſt he had no time to diſcuſs; and indeed it would have been a laborious undertaking. To draw up a defence of ſuch a ſeries of enormities, would have required a life at leaſt as long as that which has been uniformly employed in the practice of them. The public opinion of the Duke of Bedford's extreme œconomy is, it ſeems, entirely without foundation. Though not very prodigal abroad, in his own family at leaſt he is regular and magnificent. He pays his debts, abhors a beggar, and makes a handſome proviſion for his ſon. His charity has improved upon the proverb, and ended where it began. Admitting the whole force of the ſingle inſtance of his domeſtic generoſity (wonderful indeed, conſidering the narrowneſs of his fortune, and the little merit of his only ſon) the public may ſtill perhaps be diſſatisfied, and demand ſome other leſs equivocal proofs of munificence. Sir William Draper ſhould have entered boldly into the detail—of indigence relieved—the arts encouraged—of ſci-

ence

ence patronized; men of learning protected, and works of genius rewarded;—in ſhort, had there been a ſingle inſtance, beſides Mr. Rigby, of bluſhing merit brought forward by the duke, for the ſervice of the public, it ſhould not have been omitted.

I wiſh it were poſſible to eſtabliſh my inference with the ſame certainty, on which I believe the principle is founded. My concluſion however was not drawn from the principle alone. I am not ſo unjuſt as to reaſon from one crime to another; though I think, that, of all the vices, avarice is moſt moſt apt to taint and corrupt the heart. I combined the known temper of the man with the extravagant conceſſions made by the ambaſſador; and though I doubt not ſufficient care was taken to leave no document of any treaſonable negociation, I ſtill maintain that the conduct * of this miniſter carries with it an internal and convincing evidence againſt him. Sir William Draper ſeems not to know the value or force of ſuch a proof. He will not permit us to judge of the motives of men, by the manifeſt tendency of their actions, nor by the notorious character of their minds. He calls for papers and witneſſes, with a ſort of triumphant ſecurity, as if nothing could be true, but what could be proved in a court of juſtice. Yet a religious man might have remembered, upon what foundation ſome truths moſt intereſting to mankind, have been re-

* If Sir William Draper will take the trouble of looking into Torcy's Memoirs, he will ſee with what little ceremony a bribe may be offered to a duke, and with what little ceremony it was *only not accepted.*

received and eſtabliſhed. If it were not for the internal evidence, which the pureſt of religions carwith it, what could have become of his once well-quoted decalogue, and of the meekneſs of his Chriſtianity.

The generous warmth of his reſentment makes him confound the order of events. He forgets that the inſults and diſtreſſes which the Duke of Bedford has ſuffered, and which Sir William has lamented with many delicate touches of the true pathetic, were only recorded in my letter to his Grace, not occaſioned by it. It was a ſimple, candid narrative of facts; though for aught I know, it may carry with it ſomething prophetic. His Grace undoubtedly has received ſeveral ominous hints; and I think, in certain circumſtances, a wiſe man would do well to prepare himſelf for the event.

But I have a charge of a heavier nature againſt Sir William Draper; he tells us that the Duke of Bedford is amenable to juſtice;—that parliament is a high and ſolemn tribunal; and that, if guilty, he may be puniſhed by due courſe of law; and all this, he ſays, with as much gravity as if he believed one word of the matter. I hope indeed, the day of impeachments will arrive, before this nobleman eſcapes out of life;—but to refer us to that mode of proceeding now, with ſuch a miniſtry, and ſuch a Houſe of Commons as the preſent, what is it, but an indecent mockery of the common ſenſe of the nation? I think he might have contented himſelf with defending the greateſt enemy, without inſulting the diſtreſſes of his country.

His

His concluding declaration of his opinion, with reſpect to the preſent condition of affairs, is too looſe and undetermined to be of any ſervice to the public. How ſtrange it is that this gentleman ſhould dedicate ſo much time and argument to the defence of worthleſs or indifferent characters, while he gives but ſeven ſolitary lines to the only ſubject, which can deſerve his attention, or do credit to his abilities.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXVI.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *Oct.* 17, 1769.

IT is not wonderful that the great cauſe, in which this country is engaged, ſhould have rouſed and engroſſed the whole attention of the people. I rather admire the generous ſpirit with which they feel and aſſert their intereſt in this important queſtion, than blame them for their indifference about any other. When the conſtitution is openly invaded, when the firſt original right of the people, from which all laws derive their authority, is directly attacked, inferior grievances naturally loſe their force, and are ſuffered to paſs by without puniſhment or obſervation. The preſent miniſtry are as ſingularly marked by their fortune, as by their crimes. Inſtead of atoning for their former conduct by any wiſe or popular meaſure, they have found, in the enormity of one fact, a cover and defence for a ſeries of meaſures,

which must have been fatal to any other administration. I fear we are too remiss in observing the whole of their proceedings. Struck with the principal figure, we do not sufficiently mark in what manner the canvass is filled up. Yet surely it is not a less crime, nor less fatal in its consequences, to encourage a flagrant breach of the law by a military force, than to make use of the forms of parliament to destroy the constitution. The ministry seem determined to give us a choice of difficulties, and, if possible, to perplex us with the multitude of their offences. The expedient is well worthy of the Duke of Grafton. But though he has preserved a gradation and variety in his measures, we should remember that the principle is uniform. Dictated by the same spirit, they deserve the same attention. The following fact, though of the most alarming nature, has not yet been clearly stated to the public, nor have the consequences of it been sufficiently understood. Had I taken it up at an early period, I should have been accused of an uncandid, malignant precipitation, as if I watched for an unfair advantage against the ministry, and would not allow them a reasonable time to do their duty. They now stand without excuse. Instead of employing the leisure they have had, in a strict examination of the offence, and punishing the offenders, they seem to have considered that indulgence as a security to them, that with a little time and management the whole affair might be buried in silence, and utterly forgotten.

A major general of the army is arrested by the sheriffs officers for a considerable debt. He persuades them to conduct him to the Tilt-Yard in

St.

St. James's Park, under ſome pretence of buſineſs which it imported him to ſettle before he was confined. He applies to a ſerjeant, not immediately on duty, to aſſiſt with ſome of his companions in favouring his eſcape. He attempts it. A buſtle enſues. The bailiffs claim their priſoner. An officer of the guards, not then on duty, takes part in the affair, applies to the lieutenant commanding the Tilt-Yard guard, and urges him to turn out his guard to relieve a general officer. The lieutenant declines interfering in perſon, but ſtands at a diſtance, and ſuffers the buſineſs to be done. The other officer takes upon himſelf to order out the guard. In a moment they are in arms, quit their guard, march, reſcue the general, and drive away the ſheriffs officers, who in vain repreſent their right to the priſoner, and the nature of the arreſt. The ſoldiers firſt conduct the general into their guard-room, then eſcort him to a place of ſafety, with bayonets fixed, and in all the forms of military triumph. I will not enlarge upon the various circumſtances which attended this atrocious proceeding. The perſonal injury received by the officers of the law in the execution of their duty, may perhaps be atoned for by ſome private compenſation. I conſider nothing but the wound, which has been given to the law itſelf, to which no remedy has been applied, no ſatisfaction made. Neither is it my deſign to dwell upon the miſconduct of the parties concerned, any farther than is neceſſary to ſhew the behaviour of the miniſtry in its true light. I would make every compaſſionate allowance for the infatuation of the priſoner, the falſe and criminal diſcretion of one officer, and the madneſs of another. I would leave

the ignorant ſoldiers entirely out of the queſtion. They are certainly the leaſt guilty, though they are the only perſons who have yet ſuffered, even in the appearance of puniſhment. The fact itſelf, however atrocious, is not the principal point to be conſidered. It might have happened under a more regular government, and with guards better diſciplined than ours. The main queſtion is, in what manner has the miniſtry acted on this extraordinary occaſion. A general officer calls upon the king's own guard, then actually on duty, to reſcue him from the laws of his country; yet at this moment he is in a ſituation no worſe, than if he had not committed an offence, equally enormous in a civil and military view.—A lieutenant upon duty deſignedly quits his guard, and ſuffers it to be drawn out by another officer, for a purpoſe which he well knew (as we may collect from an appearance of caution, which only makes his behaviour the more criminal) to be in the higheſt degree illegal. Has this gentleman been called to a court-martial to anſwer for his conduct? No. Has it been cenſured? No. Has it been in any ſhape inquired into? No.—Another lieutenant, not upon duty, nor even in his regimentals, is daring enough to order even the king's guard, over which he had properly no command, and engages them in a violation of the laws of his country, perhaps the moſt ſingular and extravagant that ever was attempted.—What puniſhment has *he* ſuffered? Literally none. Suppoſing he ſhould be proſecuted at common law for the reſcue, will that circumſtance, from which the miniſtry can derive no merit, excuſe or juſtify their ſuffering ſo flagrant a breach of military diſcipline to paſs by unpuniſhed

and

and unnoticed? Are they aware of the outrage offered to their ſovereign, when his own proper guard is ordered out to ſtop, by main force, the execution of his laws? What are we to conclude from ſo ſcandalous a neglect of their duty, but that they have other views, which can only be anſwered by ſecuring the attachment of the guards? The miniſter would hardly be ſo cautious of offending them, if he did not mean, in due time, to call for their aſſiſtance.

With reſpect to the parties themſelves, let it be obſerved, that theſe gentlemen are neither young officers, nor very young men. Had they belonged to the unfledged race of enſigns, who infeſt our ſtreets and diſhonour our public places, it might perhaps be ſufficient to ſend them back to that diſcipline, from which their parents, judging lightly from the maturity of their vices, had removed them too ſoon. In this caſe, I am ſorry to ſee, not ſo much the folly of youth, as the ſpirit of the corps, and the connivance of government. I do not queſtion that there are many brave and worthy officers in the regiments of guards. But conſidering them as a corps, I fear it will be found that they are neither good ſoldiers nor good ſubjects. Far be it from me to inſinuate the moſt diſtant reflection upon the army. On the contrary, I honour and eſteem the profeſſion; and if theſe gentlemen were better ſoldiers, I am ſure they would be better ſubjects. It is not that there is any internal vice or defect in the profeſſion itſelf, as regulated in this country, but that it is the ſpirit of this particular corps to deſpiſe their profeſſion, and that, while they vainly aſſume the lead of the army, they make

it matter of impertinent compariſon and triumph over the braveſt troops in the world (I mean our marching regiments) that *they* indeed ſtand upon higher ground, and are privileged to neglect the laborious forms of military diſcipline and duty. Without dwelling longer upon a moſt invidious ſubject, I ſhall leave it to military men, who have ſeen a ſervice more active than the parade, to determine whether or no I ſpeak truth.

How far this dangerous ſpirit has been encouraged by government, and to what pernicious purpoſes it may be applied hereafter, well deſerves our moſt ſerious conſideration. I know indeed, that when this affair happened, an affectation of alarm ran through the miniſtry. Something muſt be done to ſave appearances. The caſe was too flagrant to be paſſed by abſolutely without notice. But how have they acted? Inſtead of ordering the officers concerned, and who ſtrictly ſpeaking, are alone guilty, to be put under arreſt, and brought to a trial, they would have it underſtood, that they did their duty compleatly, in confining a ſerjeant and four private ſoldiers, until they ſhould be demanded by the civil power; ſo that while the officers, who ordered or permitted the thing to be done, eſcape without cenſure, the poor men who obeyed thoſe orders, who in a military view are no way reſponſible for what they did, and who for that reaſon have been diſcharged by the civil magiſtrates, are the only objects whom the miniſtry have thought proper to expoſe to puniſhment. They did not venture to bring even theſe men to a court martial, becauſe they knew their evidence would be fatal to ſome perſons, whom they were determined to protect.

Other-

Otherwiſe, I doubt not, the lives of theſe unhappy, friendleſs ſoldiers would long ſince have been ſacrificed without ſcruple, to the ſecurity of their guilty officers.

I have been accuſed of endeavouring to enflame the paſſions of the people.—Let me now appeal to their underſtanding. If there be any tool of adminiſtration daring enough to deny theſe facts, or ſhameleſs enough to defend the conduct of the miniſtry, let him come forward. I care not under what title he appears. He ſhall find me ready to maintain the truth of my narrative, at the hazard of my utmoſt credit with the public.

Under the moſt arbitrary governments, the common adminiſtration of juſtice is ſuffered to take its courſe. The ſubject, though robbed of his ſhare in the legiſlature, is ſtill protected by the laws. The political freedom of the Engliſh conſtitution was once the pride and honour of an Engliſhman. The civil equality of the laws preſerved the property, and defended the ſafety of the ſubject. Are theſe glorious privileges the birthright of the people, or are we only tenants at the will of the miniſtry?—But that I know there is a ſpirit of reſiſtance in the hearts of my countrymen, that they value life, not by its conveniences, but by the independance and dignity of their condition, I ſhould, at this moment, appeal only to their diſcretion. I ſhould perſuade them to baniſh from their minds all memory of what we are; I ſhould tell them this is not a time to remember that we were Engliſhmen; and give it as my laſt advice, to make ſome early agreement with the miniſter, that ſince it has pleaſed him to rob us of thoſe political rights, which once diſtinguiſhed

guiſhed the inhabitants of a country, where honour was happineſs, he would leave us at leaſt the humble, obedient ſecurity of citizens, and graciouſly condeſcend to protect us in our ſubmiſſion.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXVII.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *October* 17, 1769.

PERFECTLY convinced as I am of my own inability to enter the liſts, or uſe my pen againſt the two-edged ſword that glitters in the hand of Junius, nothing but my being impelled by that *uncommon* kind of gratitude, which makes us not only thankful for benefits received, but inclines us to love and reſpect our benefactor, could tempt me forth to ſo unequal a combat, or prevail on me to offer even a fact to the public, through ſuch a channel as our news-papers.

Let my motive then plead my excuſe, while I reply to the charge which appears moſt difficult to be cleared, becauſe it is moſt general, which Junius has made againſt the Duke of Bedford.

Junius calls upon Sir William Draper to 'enter boldly into the detail of indigence relieved; of arts encouraged; of ſcience patronized; of men of learning protected; and works of genius rewarded.'

Under any of theſe denominations, it muſt be extremely painful to a woman, whoſe higheſt merit ſhould

ſhould be modeſt, and of courſe a *bluſhing merit*, to appear; yet truth and gratitude ought to ſurmount female delicacy ſo far, as to relate a matter of fact, which ſhe hopes will be one proof of the injuſtice of the charge here quoted againſt the Duke of Bedford.

When his Grace was lord lieutenant of Ireland, the ſeries of letters between Henry and Frances happened to fall into his hands. In the preface, Henry ſpeaks of the diſtreſſes of his fortune, and the juſtifiable means by which thoſe diſtreſſes were occaſioned.—His Grace's humanity was affected; he enquired into the author's ſituation, and on finding it to be what is there deſcribed, unſolicited by aught but his own noble nature, he ſent for Henry, and in the moſt obliging and gracious manner preſented him with a patent employment, which was at that time vacant.

Sure I am, that many parallel, perhaps more meritorious, inſtances of his Grace's munificence, might be recounted, if thoſe, who like me have partaken of them, had virtue ſufficient to acknowledge themſelves *obliged*, when they had received an *obligation*.

FRANCES.

LET-

LETTER XVIII.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *October* 20, 1769.

I VERY ſincerely applaud the ſpirit with which a lady has paid the debt of gratitude to her benefactor. Though I think ſhe has miſtaken the point, ſhe ſhews a virtue which makes her reſpectable. The queſtion turned upon the perſonal generoſity or avarice of a man, whoſe private fortune is immenſe.

The proofs of his munificence muſt be drawn from the uſes to which he has applied that fortune. I was not ſpeaking of a lord lieutenant of Ireland, but of a rich Engliſh Duke, whoſe wealth gave him the means of doing as much good in this country, as he derived from his power in another. I am far from wiſhing to leſſen the merit of this ſingle benevolent action;—perhaps it is the more conſpicuous from ſtanding alone. All I mean to ſay is, that it proves nothing in the preſent argument.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER XXIX.

A LETTER OF MODESTUS TO JUNIUS.

SIR, *November* 13, 1769.

THREE weeks are elapſed ſince you favoured the public with an eſſay on the arreſt of a general officer. You wreſted the circumſtances with which it was attended, into a crime againſt adminiſtration. You told the ſtory in your own way; you reaſoned upon it in your own way alſo; you abuſed, you praiſed, you challenged, and you concluded. In all this it would be difficult to decide, whether the inveteracy of your malice, the abſurdity of your argument, the barbarity of your intention, or the dullneſs of your ſtile and compoſition, appeared moſt conſpicuous.

But, Sir, waving the reſt, you *challenged*, and theſe are preciſe terms of your defiance: 'I have 'been accuſed of endeavouring to enflame the paſ-'ſions of the people—let me now appeal to their 'underſtanding.—If there be any tool of adminiſtra-'tion daring enough to deny theſe facts, or ſhame-'leſs enough to defend the conduct of the miniſtry, 'let him come forward. I care not under what ti-'tle he appears. He ſhall find me ready to main-'tain the truth of my narrative, and the juſtice of 'my obſervations upon it, at the hazard of my ut-'moſt credit with the public.'

Two days after your letter made its appearance in the Public Advertiſer, an anſwer to it appeared in the Gazetteer, in which your challenge was accepted

LETTER XVIII.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *October* 20, 1769.

I VERY ſincerely applaud the ſpirit with which a lady has paid the debt of gratitude to her benefactor. Though I think ſhe has miſtaken the point, ſhe ſhews a virtue which makes her reſpectable. The queſtion turned upon the perſonal generoſity or avarice of a man, whoſe private fortune is immenſe.

The proofs of his munificence muſt be drawn from the uſes to which he has applied that fortune. I was not ſpeaking of a lord lieutenant of Ireland, but of a rich Engliſh Duke, whoſe wealth gave him the means of doing as much good in this country, as he derived from his power in another. I am far from wiſhing to leſſen the merit of this ſingle benevolent action;—perhaps it is the more conſpicuous from ſtanding alone. All I mean to ſay is, that it proves nothing in the preſent argument.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER XXIX.

A LETTER OF MODESTUS TO JUNIUS.

SIR, *November* 13, 1769.

THREE weeks are elapſed ſince you favoured the public with an eſſay on the arreſt of a general officer. You wreſted the circumſtances with which it was attended, into a crime againſt adminiſtration. You told the ſtory in your own way; you reaſoned upon it in your own way alſo; you abuſed, you praiſed, you challenged, and you concluded. In all this it would be difficult to decide, whether the inveteracy of your malice, the abſurdity of your argument, the barbarity of your intention, or the dullneſs of your ſtile and compoſition, appeared moſt conſpicuous.

But, Sir, waving the reſt, you *challenged*, and theſe are preciſe terms of your defiance: 'I have 'been accuſed of endeavouring to enflame the paſ-'ſions of the people—let me now appeal to their 'underſtanding.—If there be any tool of adminiſtra-'tion daring enough to deny theſe facts, or ſhame-'leſs enough to defend the conduct of the miniſtry, 'let him come forward. I care not under what ti-'tle he appears. He ſhall find me ready to main-'tain the truth of my narrative, and the juſtice of 'my obſervations upon it, at the hazard of my ut-'moſt credit with the public.'

Two days after your letter made its appearance in the Public Advertiſer, an anſwer to it appeared in the Gazetteer, in which your challenge was accepted

cepted in the following words: 'You challenge 'any tool of adminiſtration to defend the conduct of 'the miniſtry; I accept of your challenge, though it 'isnot addreſſed to me. I am no tool of adminiſtra- 'tion, but your equal, Junius, perhaps your ſupe- 'rior, in every thing that may become a man. I 'deſire for judges of the conteſt, juſtice, candor, 'and impartiality. I dare you to the uttermoſt; 'and if I do not make you appear, in the eyes 'of all reaſonable men, as contemptible as you 'deſerve to be, let the ſcorn be transferred to my- 'ſelf.'

What is the reaſon, Junius, that you have hitherto taken no notice of that letter? The author of it, too candid to affirm what he could not immediately prove, ſuppoſed, in his argument, your narrative to be true; and even on that ſuppoſition, he demonſtrated your obſervations not only unjuſt, but inconſiſtent, even to abſurdity. But if he could not with certain knowledge deny the fact, he doubted it; he told you ſo; and, in the belief that no man would give a formal challenge without purſuing it, he has enquired into the truth of that fact. He tells you now, and will maintain it at the utmoſt hazard of HIS credit with the public, that your narrative is no leſs falſe than your obſervations are fallacious. It is falſe (for inſtance) that the general officer applied to a ſerjeant, not on duty, to favour his eſcape. It is falſe, that the officer of the guard ſtood at a diſtance, and ſuffered the buſineſs to be done. He was ſpoke to by the other officer in the coffee-houſe, and he not only declined interfering in perſon, but flatly refuſed his aſſiſtance directly or indirectly. He did more; he diſſuaded his brother

ther officer from his intention, and believed he had prevailed. His only fault was, being the dupe of the other's apparent repentance, who left the coffee-houſe as if he intended to proceed no farther in the attempt; and took the opportunity to apply to ſome ſoldiers of the guard, while the officer who commanded it remained in the coffee-houſe. It is falſe that the guard was turned out, or under arms. And it is a moſt malicious conſtruction of the fairеſt conduct, to blame adminiſtration, becauſe theſe gentlemen have not been puniſhed by military law.

The truth is, that it was propoſed to try the offenders by military law, immediately after the offence was committed; but, in a conſultation with the civil magiſtrate, it was judged improper, leſt a military trial ſhould prejudge the action now depending, and in which the offenders are at preſent under bail. A fair trial is the right of every Engliſhman, whatever offence he may be guilty of. Our civil rights are our moſt precious bleſſings; and our form of trial is the bulwark of theſe rights; and, Sir, you contradict the principles you profeſs, when you endeavour to ſet up martial, in oppoſition to common law, and give that the lead which ought to follow. Had theſe gentlemen been firſt tried by military law, the evidences brought before a court-martial muſt have been afterwards examined in the courts of law; but witneſſes already examined upon oath, according to the arbitrary proceedings of a court-martial, cannot be unexceptionable in a ſubſequent civil action. Their evidence, however extorted, would awe them to conceal, or diſguiſe the truth, which our form of civil trial is ſo well calculated to diſcover. And you,

Junius, a patriot, an aſſertor of the rights of Engliſhmen, would have declaimed and exclaimed, with ſome appearance of juſtice, againſt the proceedings of a court-martial, which ſhould have deprived theſe officers of that fair and legal trial, which they have a right, as Engliſhmen, to demand.

Our military laws preſcribe the puniſhment of caſhiering, for offences of this nature. But how is this crime to be proved? Only by the verdict of a jury in a civil action; and the judgment upon it is evidence of record in the ſubſequent court-martial: but theſe are matters of which you are ignorant. You go on in your own method, to clap the cart before the horſe; and you would have puniſhed by military law, an offence which military law cannot take cognizance of, until it has been legally found one by the verdict of a jury. Thus, blinded by your paſſion, or unacquainted with the conſtitution, you would overturn it, to wreck your reſentment againſt a miniſtry, which, in this inſtance at leaſt, has acted in its trueſt ſpirit.

It is time, Junius, you ſhould think of the challenge you gave. I know you to be ſlow, and I have not hurried you. But ſomething is due to your character; which has already ſuffered in the article of challenges. I ſhould wiſh to meet you on this ground; or, indeed, on any other. Stand forward, man, the cauſe is not ſo bad, but ſomething may ſtill be ſaid for it: you can, at leaſt, call names. I warn you, however, that I ſhall take no notice of any of your myrmidons; not even Phylo-Junius, ſhould you write another letter under that ſignature. But I warn you alſo, that if you ſuffer yourſelf to be thus inſulted, after the provocation

you

you have given, you are ruined with the public, and you will paſs, even in the opinion of Wilkes and Liberty, for what you are, the baffled emiſſary of a deſperate faction.

MODESTUS.

LETTER XXX.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *November* 15, 1769.

I ADMIT the claim of a gentleman, who publiſhes in the Gazetteer under the name of *Modeſtus*. He has ſome right to expect an anſwer from me; though I think, not ſo much from the merit or importance of his objections, as from my own voluntary engagement. I had a reaſon for not taking notice of him ſooner, which, as he is a candid perſon, I believe he will think ſufficient. In my firſt letter, I took it for granted, from the time which had elapſed, that there was no intention to cenſure, nor even to try the perſons concerned in the reſcue of general Ganſel; but *Modeſtus* having ſince either affirmed, or ſtrongly inſinuated, that the offenders might ſtill be brought to a legal trial, any attempt to prejudice the cauſe, or to prejudice the minds of a jury, or a court-martial, would be highly improper.

A man, more hoſtile to the miniſtry than I am, would not ſo often remind them of their duty. If the duke of Grafton will not perform the duty of his ſtation, why is he miniſter?—I will not deſcend

to a ſcurrilous altercation with any man: but this is a ſubject too important to be paſſed over with a ſilent indifference. If the gentlemen, whoſe conduct is in queſtion, are not brought to a trial, the Duke of Grafton ſhall hear from me again.

The motives on which I am ſuppoſed to have taken up this cauſe, are of little importance, compared with the facts themſelves, and the obſervations I have made upon them. Without a vain profeſſion of integrity, which, in theſe times might juſtly be ſuſpected, I ſhall ſhew myſelf in effect a friend to the intereſts of my countrymen, and leave it to them to determine, whether I am moved by a perſonal malevolence to three private gentlemen, or merely by a hope of perplexing the miniſtry, or whether I am animated by a juſt and honourable purpoſe of obtaining a ſatisfaction to the laws of this county, equal, if poſſible, to the violation they have ſuffered.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXXI.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *November* 29, 1769.

THOUGH my opinion of your Grace's integrity was but little affected by the coyneſs with which you received Mr. Vaughan's propoſals, I confeſs I give you ſome credit for your diſcretion. You had a fair opportunity of diſplaying a certain delicacy, of which you had not been ſuſpected; and you were in the right to make uſe of it. By laying in a moderate

derate ſtock of reputation, you undoubtedly meant to provide for the future neceſſities of your character, that with an honourable reſiſtance upon record, you might ſafely indulge your genius, and yield to a favourite inclination with ſecurity. But you have diſcovered your purpoſes too ſoon, and, inſtead of the modeſt reſerve of virtue, have ſhewn us the termagant chaſtity of a prude, who gratifies her paſſions with diſtinction, and proſecutes one lover for a rape, while ſhe ſolicits the lewd embraces of another.

Your cheek turns pale: for a guilty conſcience tells you, you are undone.—Come forward, thou virtuous miniſter, and tell the world by what intereſt Mr. Hine has been recommended to ſo extraordinary a mark of his Majeſty's favour; what was the price of the patent he has bought, and to what honourable purpoſe the purchaſe money has been applied. Nothing leſs than many thouſands could pay Colonel Burgoyne's expences at Preſton. Do you dare to proſecute ſuch a creature as Vaughan, while you are baſely ſetting up the Royal Patronage to auction? Do you dare to complain of an attack upon your own honour, while you are ſelling the favours of the crown, to raiſe a fund for corrupting the morals of the people? And, do you think it poſſible ſuch enormities ſhould eſcape without impeachment? It is indeed highly your intereſt to maintain the preſent houſe of commons. Having ſold the nation to you in groſs, they will undoubtedly protect you in the retail; for while they patronize your crimes, they feel for their own.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXXII.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *December* 12, 1769.

I FIND with ſome ſurprize, that you are not ſupported as you deſerve. Your moſt determined advocates have ſcruples about them, which you are unacquainted with; and, though there be nothing too hazardous for your Grace to engage in, there are ſome things too infamous for the vileſt proſtitute of a news-paper to defend. In what other manner ſhall we account for the profound, ſubmiſſive ſilence, which you and your friends have obſerved upon a charge which called immediately for the cleareſt refutation, and would have juſtified the ſevereſt meaſures of reſentment? I did not attempt to blaſt your character by an indirect, ambiguous inſinuation, but candidly ſtated to you a plain fact, which ſtruck directly at the integrity of a privy-counſellor, of a firſt commiſſioner of the treaſury, and of a leading miniſter, who is ſuppoſed to enjoy the firſt ſhare in his Majeſty's confidence. In every one of theſe capacities I employed the moſt moderate terms to charge you with treachery to your Sovereign, and breach of truſt in your office. I accuſed you of having ſold, or permitted to be ſold, a patent place in the collection of the cuſtoms at Exeter, to one Mr. Hine, who, unable or unwilling to depoſit the whole purchaſe-money himſelf, raiſed part of it by contribution, and has now a certain Dr. Brooke quartered upon the ſalary for one hundred

dred pounds a year.—No ſale by the candle was ever conducted with greater formality.—I affirm that the price, at which the place was knocked down (and which, I have good reaſon to think, was not leſs than three thouſand five hundred pounds) was, with your connivance and conſent, paid to Colonel Burgoyne, to reward him, I preſume, for the decency of his deportment at Preſton; or to reimburſe him, perhaps, for the fine of one thouſand pounds, which, for that very deportment the court of King's Bench thought proper to ſet upon him.—It is not often that the Chief Juſtice and the Prime Miniſter are ſo ſtrangely at variance in their opinions of men and things.

I thank God there is not in human nature a degree of impudence daring enough to deny the charge I have fixed upon you. Your courteous ſecretary, your confidential architect, are ſilent as the grave. Even Mr. Rigby's countenance fails him. He violates his ſecond nature, and bluſhes whenever he ſpeaks of you.—Perhaps the noble Colonel himſelf will relieve you. No man is more tender of his reputation. He is not only nice, but perfectly ſore in every thing that touches his honour. If any man, for example, were to accuſe him of taking his ſtand at a gaming-table, and watching, with the ſobereſt attention, for a fair opportunity of engaging a drunken young nobleman at picquet, he would undoubtedly conſider it as an infamous aſperſion upon his character, and reſent it like a man of honour.—Acquitting him therefore of drawing a regular and ſplendid ſubſiſtance from any unworthy practices, either in his own houſe or elſewhere, let

me

me aſk your Grace, for what military merits you have been pleaſed to reward him with a military government? He had a regiment of dragoons, which one would imagine, was at leaſt an equivalent for any ſervices he ever performed. Beſides, he is but a young officer, conſidering his preferment, and, excepting his activity at Preſton, not very conſpicuous in his profeſſion. But it ſeems, the ſale of a civil employment was not ſufficient, and military governments, which were intended for the ſupport of worn-out veterans, muſt be thrown into the ſcale, to defray the extenſive bribery of a conteſted election. Are theſe the ſteps you take to ſecure to your Sovereign the attachment of his army? With what countenance dare you appear in the royal preſence, branded as you are with the infamy of a notorious breach of truſt? With what countenance can you take your ſeat at the treaſury-board, or in council, when you feel that every circulating whiſper is at your expence alone, and ſtabs you to the heart? Have you a ſingle friend in parliament ſo ſhameleſs ſo thoroughly abandoned, as to undertake your defence? You know, my Lord, that there is not a man in either houſe, whoſe character, however flagitious, would not be ruined by mixing his reputation with yours; and does not your heart inform you, that you are degraded below the condition of a man, when you are obliged to hear theſe inſults with ſubmiſſion, and even to thank me for my moderation?

We are told, by the higheſt judicial authority, that Mr. Vaughan's offer to purchaſe the reverſion of a patent in Jamaica (which he was otherwiſe ſuffici-

ſufficiently entitled to) amounted to a high miſdemeanour. Be it ſo: and if he deſerves it, let him be puniſhed. But the learned judge might have had a fairer opportunity of diſplaying the powers of his eloquence. Having delivered himſelf with ſo much energy upon the criminal nature, and dangerous conſequences of any attempt to corrupt a man in your Grace's ſtation, what would he have ſaid to the miniſter himſelf, to that very privy-counſellor, to that firſt commiſſioner of the treaſury, who does not wait for, but impatiently ſolicits the touch of corruption; who employs the meaneſt of his creatures in theſe honourable ſervices, and forgetting the genius and fidelity of his ſecretary, deſcends to apply to his houſe builder for aſſiſtance?

This affair, my Lord, will do infinite credit to government, if, to clear your character, you ſhould think proper to bring it into the houſe of commons, or into the court of King's Bench.—But, my Lord, you dare not do either.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER XXXIII.

TO THE KING.

Dec. 19. 1769.

When the complaints of a brave and powerful people are obſerved to increaſe in proportion to the wrongs they have ſuffered; when, inſtead of ſinking into ſubmiſſion, they are rouſed to reſiſtance, the time will ſoon arrive, at which every inferior conſideration muſt yield to the ſecurity of the Sovereign, and to the general ſafety of the ſtate. There is a moment of difficulty and danger, at which flattery and falſehood can no longer deceive, and ſimplicity itſelf can no longer be miſled. Let us ſuppoſe it arrived. Let us ſuppoſe a gracious, well intentioned prince, made ſenſible at laſt of the great duty he owes to his people, and of his own diſgraceful ſituation; that he looks round him for aſſiſtance, and aſks for no advice, but how to gratify the wiſhes, and ſecure the happineſs of his ſubjects. In theſe circumſtances it may be matter of curious SPECULATION to conſider, if an honeſt man were permitted to approach a King, in what terms he would addreſs himſelf to his Sovereign. Let it be imagined, no matter how improbable, that the firſt prejudice againſt his character is removed, that the ceremonious difficulties of an audience are ſurmounted, that he feels himſelf animated by the pureſt and moſt honourable affections to his King and country, and that the great perſon, whom he addreſſes, has ſpirit enough

nough to liſten to him with attention. Unacquainted with the vain impertinence of forms, he would deliver his ſentiments with dignity and firmneſs, but not without reſpect.

SIR,

IT is the misfortune of your life, and originally the cauſe of every reproach and diſtreſs, which has attended your government, that you ſhould never have been acquainted with the language of truth, until you heard it in the complaints of your people. It is not however too late to correct the error of your education. We are ſtill inclined to make an indulgent allowance for the pernicious leſſons you received in your youth, and to form the moſt ſanguine hopes from the natural benevolence of your diſpoſition. We are far from thinking you capable of a direct, deliberate purpoſe to invade thoſe original rights of your ſubjects, on which all their civil and political liberties depend. Had it been poſſible for us to entertain a ſuſpicion ſo diſhonourable to your character, we ſhould long ſince have adopted a ſtyle of remonſtrance very diſtant from the humility of complaint. The doctrine inculcated by our laws, *That the King can do no Wrong*, is admitted without reluctance. We ſeparate the amiable good-natured prince from the folly and treachery of his ſervants, and the private virtues of the man from the vices of his government. Were it not for this juſt diſtinction, I know not whether your Majeſty's condition, or that of the Engliſh nation, would deſerve moſt to be lamented. I would prepare your mind for a favourable reception of truth, by removing every painful,

ful, offenſive idea of perſonal reproach. Your ſubjects, Sir, wiſh for nothing but that, as *they* are reaſonable and affectionate enough to ſeparate your perſon from your government, ſo *you*, in your turn, ſhould diſtinguiſh between the conduct, which becomes the permanent dignity of a King, and that which ſerves only to promote the temporary intereſt and miſerable ambition of a miniſter.

You aſcended the throne with a declared, and, I doubt not, a ſincere reſolution of giving univerſal ſatisfaction to your ſubjects. You found them pleaſed with the novelty of a young prince, whoſe countenance promiſed even more than his words, and loyal to you not only from principle, but paſſion. It was not a cold profeſſion of allegiance to the firſt magiſtrate, but a partial, animated attachment to a favourite prince, the native of their country. They did not wait to examine your conduct, nor to be determined by experience, but gave you a generous credit for the future bleſſings of your reign, and paid you in advance the deareſt tribute of their affections. Such, Sir, was once the diſpoſition of a people, who now ſurround your throne with reproaches and complaints. Do juſtice to yourſelf. Baniſh from your mind thoſe unworthy opinions with which ſome intereſted perſons have laboured to poſſeſs you. Diſtruſt the men, who tell you that the Engliſh are naturally light and inconſtant;—that they complain without a cauſe. Withdraw your confidence equally from all parties; from miniſters, favourites, and relations; and let there be one moment in your life in which you have conſulted your own underſtanding.

When

When you affectedly renounced the name of Engliſhman, believe me, Sir, you were perſuaded to pay a very ill-judged compliment to one part of your ſubjects, at the expence of another. While the natives of Scotland are not in actual rebellion, they are undoubtedly intitled to protection; nor do I mean to condemn the policy of giving ſome encouragement to the novelty of their affections for the houſe of Hanover. I am ready to hope for every thing from their new-born zeal, and from the future ſteadineſs of their allegiance. But hitherto they have no claim to your favour. To honour them with a determined predilection and confidence, in excluſion of your Engliſh ſubjects, who placed your family, and, in ſpite of treachery and rebellion, have ſupported it upon the throne, is a miſtake too groſs, even for the unſuſpecting generoſity of youth. In this error we ſee a capital violation of the moſt obvious rules of policy and prudence. We trace it, however, to an original bias in your education, and are ready to allow for your inexperience.

To the ſame early influence we attribute it, that you have deſcended to take a ſhare not only in the narrow views and intereſts of particular perſons, but in the fatal malignity of their paſſions. At your acceſſion to the throne, the whole ſyſtem of government was altered, not from wiſdom or deliberation, but becauſe it had been adopted by your predeceſſor. A little, perſonal motive of pique and reſentment was ſufficient to remove the ableſt ſervants of the crown; but it is not in this country, Sir, that ſuch men can be diſhonoured by the frowns of a King. They were diſmiſſed, but could

not be diſgraced. Without entering into a minuter diſcuſſion of the merits of the peace, we may obſerve, in the imprudent hurry with which the firſt overtures from France were accepted, in the conduct of the negociation, and terms of the treaty, the ſtrongeſt marks of that precipitate ſpirit of conceſſion, with which a certain part of your ſubjects have been at all times ready to purchaſe a peace with the natural enemies of this country. On *your* part we are ſatisfied that every thing was honourable and ſincere, and if England was ſold to France, we doubt not that your Majeſty was equally betrayed. The conditions of the peace were matter of grief and ſurprize to your ſubjects, but not the immediate cauſe of their preſent diſcontent.

Hitherto, Sir, you had been ſacrificed to the prejudices and paſſions of others. With what firmneſs will you bear the mention of your own?

A man, not very honourably diſtinguiſhed in the world, commences a formal attack upon your favourite, conſidering nothing, but how he might beſt expoſe his perſon and principles to deteſtation, and the national character of his countrymen to contempt. The natives of that country, Sir, are as much diſtinguiſhed by a peculiar character as by your Majeſty's favour. Like another choſen people, they have been conducted into the land of plenty, where they find themſelves effectually marked, and divided from mankind. There is hardly a period, at which the moſt irregular character may not be redeemed. The miſtakes of one ſex find a retreat in patriotiſm; thoſe of the other in devotion. Mr. Wilkes brought with him into politics the

ſame

ſame liberal ſentiments by which his private conduct had been directed, and ſeemed to think that, as there are few exceſſes, in which an Engliſh gentleman may not be permitted to indulge, the ſame latitude was allowed him in the choice of his political principles, and in the ſpirit of maintaining them.—I mean to ſtate, not entirely to defend his conduct. In the earneſtneſs of his zeal, he ſuffered ſome unwarrantable inſinuations to eſcape him. He ſaid more than moderate men would juſtify; but not enough to entitle him to the honour of your Majeſty's perſonal reſentment. The rays of Royal indignation, collected upon him, ſerved only to illuminate, and could not conſume. Animated by the favour of the people on one ſide, and heated by perſecution on the other, his views and ſentiments changed with his ſituation. Hardly ſerious at firſt, he is now an enthuſiaſt. The coldeſt bodies warm with oppoſition, the hardeſt ſparkle in colliſion. There is a holy miſtaken zeal in politics as well as religion. By perſuading others, we convince ourſelves. The paſſions are engaged, and create a maternal affection in the mind, which forces us to love the cauſe for which we ſuffer.—Is this a contention worthy of a King? Are you not ſenſible how much the meanneſs of the cauſe gives an air of ridicule to the ſerious difficulties into which you have been betrayed? The deſtruction of one man has been now, for many years, the ſole object of your government, and if there can be any thing ſtill more diſgraceful, we have ſeen, for ſuch an object, the utmoſt influence of the executive power, and every miniſterial artifice exerted without ſucceſs. Nor can you ever ſucceed, unleſs *he* ſhould be imprudent enough to forfeit the

protection of thoſe laws, to which you owe your crown, or unleſs your miniſters ſhould perſuade you to make it a queſtion of force alone, and try the whole ſtrength of government in oppoſition to the people. The leſſons *he* has received from experience, will probably guard him from ſuch exceſs of folly; and in your Majeſty's virtues we find an unqueſtionable aſſurance that no illegal violence will be attempted.

Far from ſuſpecting you of ſo horrible a deſign, we would attribute the continued violation of the laws, and even this laſt enormous attack upon the vital principles of the conſtitution, to an ill-adviſed, unworthy, perſonal reſentment. From one falſe ſtep you have been betrayed into another, and as the cauſe was unworthy of you, your miniſters were determined that the prudence of the execution ſhould correſpond with the wiſdom and dignity of the deſign. They have reduced you to the neceſſity of chooſing out of a variety of difficulties;—to a ſituation ſo unhappy, that you can neither do wrong without ruin, nor right without affliction. Theſe worthy ſervants have undoubtedly given you many ſingular proofs of their abilities. Not contented with making Mr. Wilkes a man of importance, they have judiciouſly transferred the queſtion from the rights and intereſts of one man to the moſt important rights and intereſts of the people, and forced your ſubjects from wiſhing well to the cauſe of an individual, to unite with him in their own. Let them proceed as they have begun, and your Majeſty need not doubt that the cataſtrophe will do no diſhonour to the conduct of the piece.

The circumſtances to which you are reduced, will not admit of a compromiſe with the Engliſh nation. Undeciſive, qualifying meaſures will diſgrace your government ſtill more than open violence, and, without ſatisfying the people, will excite their contempt. They have too much underſtanding and ſpirit to accept of an indirect ſatisfaction for a direct injury. Nothing leſs than a repeal, as formal as the reſolution itſelf, can heal the wound which has been given to the conſtitution, nor will any thing leſs be accepted. I can readily believe that there is an influence ſufficient to recal that pernicious vote. The houſe of commons undoubtedly conſider their duty to the crown as paramount to all other obligations. To *us* they are only indebted for an accidental exiſtence, and have juſtly tranſferred their gratitude from their parents to their benefactors;—from thoſe, who gave them birth, to the miniſter, from whoſe benevolence they derive the comforts and pleaſures of their political life;—who has taken the tendereſt care of their infancy, relieves their neceſſities without offending their delicacy, and has given them, what they value moſt, a virtuous education. But, if it were poſſible for their integrity to be degraded to a condition ſo vile and abject, that, compared with it, the preſent eſtimation they ſtand in is a ſtate of honour and reſpect, conſider, Sir, in what manner you will afterwards proceed. Can you conceive that the people of this country will long ſubmit to be governed by ſo flexible a houſe of commons! It is not in the nature of human ſociety, that any form of government, in ſuch circumſtances, can long be preſerved. In ours the general contempt of the people is as fatal as

their deteſtation. Such, I am perſuaded, would be the neceſſary effect of any baſe conceſſion made by the preſent houſe of commons, and, as a qualifying meaſure would not be accepted, it remains for you to decide whether you will, at any hazard, ſupport a ſet of men, who have reduced you to this unhappy dilemma, or whether you will gratify the united wiſhes of the whole people of England by diſſolving the parliament.

Taking it for granted, as I do very ſincerely, that you have perſonally no deſign againſt the conſtitution, or any views inconſiſtent with the good of your ſubjects, I think you cannot heſitate long upon the choice, which it equally concerns your intereſt, and your honour to adopt. On one ſide, you hazard the affections of all your Engliſh ſubjects; you relinquiſh every hope of repoſe to yourſelf, and you endanger the eſtabliſhment of your family for ever. All this you venture for no object whatſoever, or for ſuch an object, as it would be an affront to you to name. Men of ſenſe will examine your conduct with ſuſpicion; while thoſe who are incapable of comprehending to what degree they are injured, afflict you with clamours equally inſolent and unmeaning. Suppoſing it poſſible that no fatal ſtruggle ſhould enſue, you determine at once to be unhappy, without the hope of compenſation either from intereſt or ambition. If an Engliſh king be hated or deſpiſed, he *muſt* be unhappy; and this perhaps is the only political truth, which he ought to be convinced of without experiment. But if the Engliſh people ſhould no longer confine their reſentment to a ſubmiſſive repreſentation of their wrongs; if, following the glorious example of their anceſtors, they ſhould no longer appeal

peal to the creature of the conſtitution, but to that high Being who gave them the rights of humanity, whoſe gifts it were ſacrilege to ſurrender, let me aſk you, Sir, upon what part of your ſubjects would you rely for aſſiſtance.

The people of Ireland have been uniformly plundered and oppreſſed. In return, they give you every day freſh marks of their reſentment. They deſpiſe the miſerable governor you have ſent them, becauſe he is the creature of lord Bute; nor is it from any natural confuſion in their ideas, that they are ſo ready to confound the original of a King with the diſgraceful repreſentation of him.

The diſtance of the colonies would make it impoſſible for them to take an active concern in your affairs, if they were as well affected to your government as they once pretended to be to your perſon. They were ready enough to diſtinguiſh between *you* and your miniſters. They complained of an act of the legiſlature, but traced the origin of it no higher than the ſervants of the crown: They pleaſed themſelves with the hope that their Sovereign, if not favourable to their cauſe, at leaſt was impartial. The deciſive, perſonal part you took againſt them, has effectually baniſhed that firſt diſtinction from their minds. They conſider you as united with your ſervants againſt America, and know how to diſtinguiſh the Sovereign and a venal parliament on one ſide, from the real ſentiments of the Engliſh people on the other. Looking forward to independence, they might poſſibly receive you for their King; but, if ever you retire to America, be aſſured they will give you ſuch a covenant to digeſt, as the preſbytery of Scotland would have been aſhamed to offer to

Charles

Charles the Second. They left their native land in ſearch of freedom, and found it in a deſart. Divided as they are into a thouſand forms of policy and religion, there is one point in which they all agree: they equally deteſt the pageantry of a King, and the ſupercilious hypocriſy of a biſhop.

It is not then from the alienated affections of Ireland or America, that you can reaſonably look for aſſiſtance; ſtill leſs from the people of England, who are actually contending for their rights, and in this great queſtion, are parties againſt you. You are not, however, deſtitute of every appearance of ſupport: You have all the Jacobites, Nonjurors, Roman Catholics, and Tories of this country, and all Scotland without exception. Conſidering from what family you are deſcended, the choice of your friends has been ſingularly directed; and truly, Sir, if you had not loſt the whig intereſt of England, I ſhould admire your dexterity in turning the hearts of your enemies. Is it poſſible for you to place any confidence in men, who, before they are faithful to you, muſt renounce every opinion, and betray every principle, both in church and ſtate, which they inherit from their anceſtors, and are confirmed in by their education? whoſe numbers are ſo inconſiderable, that they have long ſince been obliged to give up the principles and language which diſtinguiſhed them as a party, and to fight under the banners of their enemies? Their zeal begins with hypocriſy, and muſt conclude in treachery. At firſt they deceive; at laſt they betray.

As to the Scotch, I muſt ſuppoſe your heart and underſtanding ſo biaſſed, from your earlieſt infancy, in their favour, that nothing leſs than *your own* miſ-

misfortunes can undeceive you. You will not accept of the uniform experience of your anceſtors? and when once a man is determined to believe, the very abſurdity of the doctrine confirms him in his faith. A bigotted underſtanding can draw a proof of attachment to the houſe of Hanover from a notorious zeal for the houſe of Stuart, and find an earneſt of future loyalty in former rebellions. Appearances are however in their favour; ſo ſtrongly indeed, that one would think they had forgotten that you are their lawful King, and had miſtaken you for a pretender to the crown. Let it be admitted then that the Scotch are as ſincere in their preſent profeſſions, as if you were in reality not an Engliſhman, but a Briton of the North, you would not be the firſt prince of their native country againſt whom they have rebelled, nor the firſt whom they have baſely betrayed. Have you forgotten, Sir, or has your favourite concealed from you that part of our hiſtory, when the unhappy Charles (and he too had private virtues) fled from the open avowed indignation of his Engliſh ſubjects, and ſurrendered himſelf at diſcretion to the good faith of his own countrymen. Without looking for ſupport in their affections as ſubjects, he applied only to their honour as gentlemen, for protection. They received him as they would your Majeſty, with bows, and ſmiles, and falſehood, and kept him until they had ſettled their bargain with the Engliſh parliament; then baſely ſold their native King to the vengeance of his enemies. This, Sir, was not the act of a few traitors, but the deliberate treachery of a Scotch parliament repreſenting the nation. A wiſe prince might draw from it two leſſons of equal utility to himſelf.

On

On one ſide he might learn to dread the undiſguiſed reſentment of a generous people, who dare openly aſſert their rights, and who, in a juſt cauſe, are ready to meet their Sovereign in the field. On the other ſide, he would be taught to apprehend ſomething far more formidable;———a fawning treachery, againſt which no prudence can guard, no courage can defend. The inſidious ſmile upon the cheek would warn him of the canker in the heart.

From the uſes, to which one part of the army has been too frequently applied, you have ſome reaſon to expect, that there are no ſervices they would refuſe. Here too we trace the partiality of your underſtanding. You take the ſenſe of the army from the conduct of the guards, with the ſame juſtice with which you collect the ſenſe of the people from the repreſentations of the miniſtry. Your marching regiments, Sir, will not make the guards their example either as ſoldiers or ſubjects. They feel and reſent, as they ought to do, that invariable, undiſtinguiſhing favour with which the guards are treated; while thoſe gallant troops, by whom every hazardous, every laborious ſervice is performed, are left to periſh in garriſons abroad, or pine in quarters at home, neglected and forgotten. If they had no ſenſe of the great original duty they owe their country, their reſentment would operate like patriotiſm, and leave your cauſe to be defended by thoſe to whom you have laviſhed the rewards and honours of their profeſſion. The Prætorian bands, enervated and debauched as they were, had ſtill ſtrength enough to awe the Roman populace: but when the diſtant legions took the alarm, they marched to Rome and gave away the empire.

On

On this ſide then, which ever way you turn your eyes, you ſee nothing but perplexity and diſtreſs. You may determine to ſupport the very miniſtry who have reduced your affairs to this deplorable ſituation: you may ſhelter yourſelf under the forms of a parliament, and ſet your people at defiance. But be aſſured, Sir, that ſuch a reſolution would be as imprudent as it would be odious. If it did not immediately ſhake your eſtabliſhment, it would rob you of your peace of mind for ever.

On the other, how different is the proſpect! How eaſy, how ſafe and honourable is the path before you! The Engliſh nation declare they are groſsly injured by their repreſentatives, and ſolicit your Majeſty to exert your lawful prerogative, and give them an opportunity of recalling a truſt, which, they find, has been ſo ſcandalouſly abuſed. You are not to be told that the power of the houſe of commons is not original, but delegated to them for the welfare of the people: from whom they received it. A queſtion of right ariſes between the conſtituent and the repreſentative body. By what authority ſhall it be decided? Will your Majeſty interfere in a queſtion in in which you have properly no immediate concern? It would be a ſtep equally odious and unneceſſary. Shall the lords be called upon to determine the rights and privileges of the commons? They cannot do it without a flagrant breach of the conſtitution. Or will you refer it to the judges? They have often told your anceſtors, that the law of parliament is above them. What party then remains but to leave it to the people to determine for themſelves? They alone are injured; and ſince there is

no

no ſuperior power to which the cauſe can be referred, they alone ought to determine.

I do not mean to perplex you with a tedious argument upon a ſubject already ſo diſcuſſed, that inſpiration could hardly throw a new light upon it. There are, however, two points of view, in which it particularly imports your Majeſty to conſider the late proceedings of the houſe of commons. By depriving a ſubject of his birthright, they have attributed to their own vote an authority equal to an act of the whole legiſlature; and, tho' perhaps not with the ſame motives, have ſtrictly followed the example of the long parliament, which firſt declared the regal office uſeleſs, and ſoon after, with as little ceremony, diſſolved the houſe of lords. The ſame pretended power, which robs an Engliſh ſubject of his birthright, may rob an Engliſh King of his crown. In another view, the reſolution of the houſe of commons, apparently not ſo dangerous to your Majeſty, is ſtill more alarming to your people. Not contented with diveſting one man of his right, they have arbitrarily conveyed that right to another. They have ſet aſide a return as illegal, without daring to cenſure thoſe officers who were particularly apprized of Mr. Wilkes's incapacity, not only by the declaration of the houſe, but expreſsly by the writ directed to them, and who nevertheleſs returned him as duly elected. They have rejected the majority of votes, the only criterion by which which our laws judge of the ſenſe of the people; they have transferred the right of election from the collective to the repreſentative body; and by theſe acts, taken ſeparately or together, they have eſſentially altered the original conſtitution of the

houſe

houſe of commons. Verſed, as your Majeſty undoubtedly is, in the Engliſh hiſtory, it cannot eaſily eſcape you, how much it is your intereſt, as well as your duty to prevent one of the three eſtates from encroaching upon the province of the other two, or aſſuming the authority of them all. When once they have departed from the great conſtitutional line, by which all their proceedings ſhould be directed, who will anſwer for their future moderation? Or what aſſurance will they give you, that, when they have trampled upon their equals, they will ſubmit to a ſuperior? Your Majeſty may learn hereafter, how nearly the ſlave and tyrant are allied.

Some of your council, more candid than the reſt, admit the abandoned profligacy of the preſent houſe of commons, but oppoſe their diſſolution upon an opinion, I confeſs not very unwarrantable, that their ſucceſſors would be equally at the diſpoſal of the treaſury. I cannot perſuade myſelf that the nation will have profited ſo little by experience. But if that opinion were well founded, you might then gratify our wiſhes at any eaſy rate, and appeaſe the preſent clamour againſt your government without offering any material injury to the favourite cauſe of corruption.

You have ſtill an honourable part to act. The affections of your ſubjects may ſtill be recovered. But before you ſubdue *their* hearts, you muſt gain a noble victory over your own. Diſcard thoſe little perſonal reſentments which have too long directed your public conduct. Pardon this man the remainder of his puniſhment, and if reſentment ſtill prevails, make it, what it ſhould have been long ſince, an act, not of mercy, but contempt. He

will ſoon fall back into his natural ſtation,—a ſilent ſenator, and hardly ſupporting the weekly eloquence of a news-paper. The gentle breath of peace would leave him on the ſurface, neglected and unremoved. It is only the tempeſt that liſts him from his place.

Without conſulting your miniſter, call together your whole council. Let it appear to the public that you can determine and act for yourſelf. Come forward to your people. Lay aſide the wretched formalities of a King, and ſpeak to your ſubjects with the ſpirit of a man, and in the language of a gentleman. Tell them you have been fatally deceived. The acknowledgement will be no diſgrace, but rather an honour to your underſtanding. Tell them you are determined to remove every cauſe of complaint againſt your government; that you will give your confidence to no man who does not poſſeſs the confidence of your ſubjects; and you will leave it to themſelves to determine, by their conduct at a future election, whether or not it be in reality the general ſenſe of the nation, that their rights have been arbitrarily invaded by the preſent houſe of commons, and the conſtitution betrayed. They will then do juſtice to their repreſentatives and to themſelves.

Theſe ſentiments, Sir, and the ſtyle they are conveyed in, may be offenſive perhaps, becauſe they are new to you. Accuſtomed to the language of courtiers, you meaſure their affections by the vehemence of their expreſſions; and when they only praiſe you indirectly, you admire their ſincerity. But this is not a time to triſle with your fortune. They deceive you, Sir, who tell you that you have

many

many friends, whose affections are founded upon a principle of personal attachment. The first foundation of friendship is not the power of conferring benefits, but the equality with which they are received, and *may* be returned. The fortune which made you a King forbade you to have a friend. It is a law of nature which cannot be violated with impunity. The mistaken prince, who looks for friendship, will find a favourite, and in that favourite the ruin of his affairs.

The people of England are loyal to the house of Hanover, not from a vain preference of one family to another, but from a conviction that the establishment of that family was necessary to the support of their civil and religious liberties. This, Sir, is a principle of allegiance equally solid and rational, fit for Englishmen to adopt, and well worthy of your Majesty's encouragement. We cannot long be deluded by nominal distinctions. The name of Stuart, of itself, is only contemptible;—armed with the Sovereign authority, their principles were formidable. The prince, who imitates their conduct, should be warned by their example; and while he plumes himself upon the security of his title to the crown, should remember, that as it was acquired by one revolution, it may be lost by another.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXXIV.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF GRAFTON.

MY LORD, *February* 14, 1770.

IF I were perſonally your enemy, I might pity and forgive you. You have every claim to compaſſion, that can ariſe from miſery and diſtreſs. The condition you are reduced to would diſarm a private enemy of his reſentment, and leave no conſolation to the moſt vindictive ſpirit, but that ſuch an object, as you are, would diſgrace the dignity of revenge. But in the relation you have borne to this country, you have no title to indulgence; and, if I had followed the dictates of my own opinion, I never ſhould have allowed you the reſpite of a moment. In your public character, you have injured every ſubject of the empire; and though an individual is not authoriſed to forgive the injuries done to ſociety, he is called upon to aſſert his ſeparate ſhare in the public reſentment. I ſubmitted however to the judgment of men, more moderate, perhaps more candid than myſelf. For my own part, I do not pretend to underſtand thoſe prudent forms of decorum, thoſe gentle rules of diſcretion, which ſome men endeavour to unite with the conduct of the greateſt and moſt hazardous affairs. Engaged in the defence of an honourable cauſe, I would take a deciſive part.—I ſhould ſcorn to provide for a future retreat, or to keep terms with a man, who preſerves no meaſures with the public. Neither the abject ſubmiſſion of deſerting his poſt in the hour of danger nor

nor even the ſacred ſhield of cowardice ſhould protect him. I would purſue him through life, and try the laſt exertion of my abilities to preſerve the periſhable infamy of his name, and make it immortal.

What then, my Lord, is this the event of all the ſacrifices you have made to Lord Bute's patronage, and to your own unfortunate ambition? Was it for this you abandoned your earlieſt friendſhips,—the warmeſt connexions of your youth, and all thoſe honourable engagements, by which you once ſolicited, and might have acquired the eſteem of your country? Have you ſecured no recompenſe for ſuch a waſte of honour? Unhappy man! what party will receive the common deſerter of all parties? Without a client to flatter, without a friend to conſole you, and with only one companion from the honeſt houſe of Bloomſbury, you muſt now retire into a dreadful ſolitude, which you have created for yourſelf. At the moſt active period of life, you muſt quit the buſy ſcene, and conceal yourſelf from the world, if you would hope to ſave the wretched remains of a ruined reputation. The vices never fail of their effect. They operate like age,—bring on diſhonour before its time, and in the prime of youth leave the character broken and exhauſted.

Yet your conduct has been myſterious, as well as contemptible. Where is now that firmneſs, or obſtinacy ſo long boaſted of by your friends, and acknowledged by your enemies? We were taught to expect, that you would not leave the ruin of this country to be compleated by other hands, but were determined either to gain a deciſive victory over the conſtitution, or to periſh bravely at leaſt, in the

laſt dike of the prerogative. You knew the danger and might have been provided for it. You took ſufficient time to prepare for a meeting with your parliament, to confirm the mercenary fidelity of your dependants, and to ſuggeſt to your Sovereign a language ſuited to his dignity at leaſt, if not to his benevolence and wiſdom. Yet, while the whole kingdom was agitated with anxious expectation upon one great point, you meanly evaded the queſtion, and, inſtead of the explicit firmneſs and deciſion of a King, gave us nothing but the miſery of a ruined grazier, and the whining piety of a Methodiſt. We had reaſon to expect, that notice would have been taken of the petitions which the King has received from the Engliſh nation; and although I can conceive ſome perſonal motives for not yielding to them, I can find none, in common prudence or decency, for treating them with contempt. Be aſſured, my Lord, the Engliſh people will not tamely ſubmit to this unworthy treatment;—they had a right to be heard, and their petitions, if not granted, deſerved to be conſidered. Whatever be the real views and doctrine of a court the Sovereign ſhould be taught to preſerve ſome forms of attention to his ſubjects, and if he will not redreſs their grievances, not to make them a topic of jeſt and mockery among lords and ladies of the bedchamber. Injuries may be atoned for and forgiven; but inſults admit of no compenſation. They degrade the mind in its own eſteem, and force it to recover its level by revenge. This neglect of the petitions was however a part of your original plan of government, nor will any conſequences it has produced account for your deſerting your Sovereign, in the midſt of that diſtreſs, in which

which you and your new friends had involved him. One would think, my Lord, you might have taken this ſpirited reſolution before you had diſſolved the laſt of thoſe early connexions, which once, even in your own opinion, did honour to your youth;—before you had obliged Lord Granby to quit a ſervice he was attached to;—before you had diſcarded one chancellor and killed another. To what an abject condition have you laboured to reduce the beſt of princes, when the unhappy man, who yields at laſt to ſuch perſonal inſtance and ſolicitation, as never can be fairly employed againſt a ſubject, feels himſelf degraded by his compliance, and is unable to ſurvive the diſgraceful honours which his gracious Sovereign had compelled him to accept. He was a man of ſpirit, for he had a quick ſenſe of ſhame, and death has redeemed his character. I know your Grace too well to appeal to your feelings upon this event; but there is another heart, not yet, I hope, quite callous to the touch of humanity, to which it ought to be a dreadful leſſon for ever.

Now, my Lord, let us conſider the ſituation to which you have conducted, and in which you have thought it adviſable to abandon your royal maſter. Whenever the people have complained, and nothing better could be ſaid in defence of the meaſures of government, it has been the faſhion to anſwer us, though not very fairly, with an appeal to the private virtues of your Sovereign. 'Has he not, to 'relieve the people, ſurrendered a conſiderable part 'of his revenue? Has he not made the judges in-'dependent, by fixing them in their places for life?' —My Lord, we acknowledge the gracious principle which gave birth to theſe conceſſions, and have nothing

thing to regret, but that it has never been adhered to. At the end of ſeven years, we are loaded with a debt of above five hundred thouſand pounds upon the civil liſt, and we now ſee the chancellor of Great Britain tyrannically forced out of his office, not for want of abilities, not for want of integrity, or of attention to his duty, but for delivering his honeſt opinion in parliament, upon the greateſt conſtitutional queſtion that has ariſen ſince the revolution.—We care not to whoſe private virtues you appeal; the theory of ſuch a government is falſehood and mockery—the practice is oppreſſion. You have laboured then (though I confeſs to no purpoſe) to rob your maſter of the only plauſible anſwer that ever was given in defence of his government,—of the opinion which the people had conceived of his perſonal honour and integrity.—The duke of Bedford was more moderate than your Grace. He only forced his maſter to violate a ſolemn promiſe made to an individual. But you, my Lord, have ſucceſsfully extended your advice to every political, every moral engagement, that could bind either the magiſtrate or the man. The condition of a King is often miſerable, but it required your Grace's abilities to make it contemptible.—You will ſay perhaps that the faithful ſervants, in whoſe hands you have left him, are able to retrieve his honour, and to ſupport his government. You have publicly declared, even ſince your reſignation, that you approved of their meaſures, and admired their conduct,—*particularly that of the Earl of Sandwich.* What a pity it is, that, with all this appearance, you ſhould think it neceſſary to ſeparate yourſelf from ſuch amiable companions. You forget, my Lord, that while you

are

are laviſh in the praiſe of men whom you deſert, you are publicly oppoſing your conduct to your opinions, and depriving yourſelf of the only plauſible pretence you had for leaving your Sovereign overwhelmed with diſtreſs; I call it *plauſible*, for, in truth, there is no reaſon whatſoever, leſs than the frowns of your maſter, that could juſtify a man of ſpirit for abandoning his poſt at a moment ſo critical and important? It is in vain to evade the queſtion. If you will not ſpeak out, the public have a right to judge from appearances. We are authorized to conclude, that you either differed from your colleagues, whoſe meaſures you ſtill affect to defend, or that you thought the adminiſtration of the King's affairs no longer tenable. You are at liberty to chooſe between the hypocrite and the coward. Your beſt friends are in doubt which way they ſhall incline. Your country unites the characters, and gives you credit for them both. For my own part, I ſee nothing inconſiſtent in your conduct. You began with betraying the people,—you conclude with betraying the King.

In your treatment of particular perſons, you have preſerved the uniformity of your character. Even Mr. Bradſhaw declares, that no man was ever ſo ill uſed as himſelf. As to the proviſion you have made for his family, he was entitled to it by the houſe he lives in. The ſucceſſor of one chancellor might well pretend to be the rival of another. It is the breach of friendſhip which touches Mr. Bradſhaw; and to ſay the truth, when a man of his rank and abilities had taken ſo active a part in your affairs, he ought not to have been let down at laſt with a miſerable penſion of fifteen hundred pounds a year. Colonel Luttrell, Mr. Onſlow, and Mr. Burgoyne,

were

were equally engaged with you, and have rather more reaſon to complain than Mr. Bradſhaw. Theſe are men, my Lord, whoſe friendſhip you ſhould have adhered to on the ſame principle, on which you deſerted Lord Rockingham, Lord Chatham, Lord Camden, and the Duke of Portland. We can eaſily account for your violating your engagements with men of honour, but why ſhould you betray your *natural* connexions? Why ſeparate yourſelf from Lord Sandwich, Lord Gower, and Mr. Rigby, or leave the three worthy gentlemen abovementioned to ſhift for themſelves? With all the faſhionable indulgence of the times, this country does not abound in characters like theirs; and you may find it a difficult matter to recruit the black catalogue of your friends.

The recollection of the royal patent you ſold to Mr. Hine, obliges me to ſay a word in defence of a man whom you have taken the moſt diſhonourable means to injure. I do not refer to the ſham proſecution which you affected to carry on againſt him. On that ground, I doubt not he is prepared to meet you with tenfold recrimination, and to ſet you at defiance. The injury you had done him affects his moral character. You knew that the offer to purchaſe the reveſion of a place, which has heretofore been ſold under a decree of the court of chancery, however imprudent in his ſituation, would no way tend to cover him with that ſort of guilt which you wiſhed to fix upon him in the eyes of the world. You laboured then, by every ſpecies of falſe ſuggeſtion, and even by publiſhing counterfeit letters, to have it underſtood that he had propoſed terms of accommodation to you, and had offered to abandon his

prin-

principles, his party, and his friends. You conſulted your own breaſt for a character of conſummate treachery, and gave it to the public for that of Mr. Vaughan. I think myſelf obliged to do this juſtide to an injured man, becauſe I was deceived by the appearances thrown out by your Grace, and have frequently ſpoken of his conduct with indignation. If he really be, what I think him, honeſt, though miſtaken, he will be happy in recovering his reputation, though at the expence of his underſtanding. Here, I ſee, the matter is likely to reſt. Your Grace is afraid to carry on the proſecution. Mr. Hine keeps quiet poſſeſſion of his purchaſe; and governor Burgoyne, relieved from the apprehenſion of refunding the money, ſits down for the remainder of his life, INFAMOUS AND CONTENTED.

I believe, my Lord, I may now take my leave of you for ever. You are no longer that reſolute miniſter, who had ſpirit to ſupport the moſt violent meaſures; who compenſated for the want of good and great qualities, by a brave determination (which ſome people admired and relied on) to maintain himſelf without them. The reputation of obſtinacy and perſeverance might have ſupplied the place of all the abſent virtues. You have now added the laſt negative to your character, and meanly confeſſed that you are deſtitute of the common ſpirit of a man. Retire then, my Lord, and hide your bluſhes from the world; for, with ſuch a load of ſhame, even BLACK may change its colour. A mind ſuch as yours, in the ſolitary hours of domeſtic enjoyment, may ſtill find topics of conſolation. You may find it in the memory of violated friendſhip; in the afflictions of an accompliſhed prince, whom you have diſgraced and deſerted, and in the agitations

tions of a great country, driven, by your councils, to the brink of deſtruction.

The palm of miniſterial firmneſs is now transferred to Lord North. He tells us ſo himſelf, with the plenitude of the *ore rotundo*; and I am ready enough to believe, that, while he can keep his place, he will not eaſily be perſuaded to reſign it. Your Grace was the firm miniſter of yeſterday; Lord North is the firm miniſter of to-day. To-morrow, perhaps, his Majeſty, in his wiſdom, may give us a rival for you both. You are too well acquainted with the temper of your late allies, to think it poſſible that Lord North ſhould be permitted to govern this country. If we may believe common fame, they have ſhewn him their ſuperiority already. His Majeſty is indeed too gracious to inſult his ſubjects, by chuſing his firſt miniſter from among the domeſtics of the Duke of Bedford. That would have been too groſs an outrage to the three kingdoms. Their purpoſe, however, is equally anſwered by puſhing forward this unhappy figure, and forcing it to bear the odium of meaſures which they in reality direct. Without immediately appearing to govern, they poſſeſs the power, and diſtribute the emoluments of government as they think proper. They ſtill adhere to the ſpirit of that calculation, which made Mr. Luttrell repreſentative of Middleſex. Far from regretting your retreat, they aſſure us very gravely, that it increaſes the real ſtrength of the miniſtry. According to this way of reaſoning, they will probably grow ſtronger, and more flouriſhing, every hour they exiſt; for I think there is hardly a day paſſes in which ſome one or other of his Majeſty's ſervants does not leave them to improve by the loſs

of

of his aſſiſtance. But, alas! their countenances ſpeak a different language. When the members drop off, the main body cannot be inſenſible of its approaching diſſolution. Even the violence of their proceedings is a ſignal of deſpair. Like broken tenants, who have had warning to quit the premiſes, they curſe their landlord, deſtroy the fixtures, throw every thing into confuſion, and care not what miſchief they do to the eſtate.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXXV.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *March* 19, 1770.

I BELIEVE there is no man, however indifferent about the intereſts of this country, who will not readily confeſs that the ſituation, to which we are now reduced, whether it has ariſen from the violence of faction, or from an arbitrary ſyſtem of government, juſtifies the moſt melancholy apprehenſions, and calls for the exertion of whatever wiſdom or vigour is left among us. The King's anſwer to the remonſtrance of the city of London, and the meaſures ſince adopted by the miniſtry, amount to a plain declaration, that the principle on which Mr. Luttrell was ſeated in the houſe of commons, is to be ſupported in all its conſequences, and carried to its utmoſt extent. The ſame ſpirit which violated the freedom of election, now invades the declaration and bill of rights, and threatens to puniſh the ſub-

ject for exerciſing a privilege, hitherto undiſputed, of petitioning the crown. The grievances of the people are aggravated by inſults; their complaints are not merely diſregarded, but checked by authority; and every one of thoſe acts, againſt which they remonſtrated, confirmed by the King's deciſive approbation. At ſuch a moment, no honeſt man will remain ſilent or inactive. However diſtinguiſhed by rank or property, in the rights of freedom we are all equal. As we are Engliſhmen, the leaſt conſiderable man among us has an intereſt equal to the proudeſt nobleman, in the laws and conſtitution of his country, and is equally called upon to make a generous contribution in ſupport of them;—whether it be the heart to conceive, the underſtanding to direct, or the hand to extricate. It is a common cauſe, in which we are all intereſted, in which we ſhould all be engaged. The man who deſerts it at this alarming criſis, is an enemy to his country, and, what I think of infinitely leſs value, a traitor to his Sovereign. The ſubject, who is truly loyal to the chief magiſtrate, will neither adviſe nor ſubmit to arbitrary meaſures. The city of London have given an example, which, I doubt not, will be followed by the whole kingdom. The noble ſpirit of the metropolis is the life-blood of the ſtate, collected at the heart: from that point it circulates with health and vigour through every artery of the conſtitution. The time is come, when the body of the Engliſh people muſt aſſert their own cauſe: conſcious of their ſtrength, and animated by a ſenſe of their duty, they will not ſurrender their birthright to miniſters, parliaments, or kings.

The

The city of London have expreſſed their ſentiments with freedom and firmneſs; they have ſpoken truth boldly; and, in whatever light their remonſtrance may be repreſented by courtiers, I defy the moſt ſubtle lawyer in this country to point out a ſingle inſtance, in which they have exceeded the truth. Even that aſſertion, which we are told is moſt offenſive to parliament, in the theory of the Engliſh conſtitution, is ſtrictly true. If any part of the repreſentative body be not choſen by the people, that part vitiates and corrupts the whole. If there be a defect in the repreſentation of the people, that power, which alone is equal to the making of the laws in this country, is not complete, and the acts of parliament under that circumſtance, are not the acts of a pure and entire legiſlature. I ſpeak of the theory of our conſtitution; and whatever difficuties or inconveniencies may attend the practice, I am ready to maintain, that, as far as the fact deviates from the principle, ſo far the practice is vicious and corrupt. I have not heard a queſtion raiſed upon any other part of the remonſtrance. That the principle, on which the Middleſex election was determined, is more pernicious in its effects, than either the levying of ſhip-money by Charles the Firſt, or the ſuſpending power aſſumed by his ſon, will hardly be diſputed by any man who underſtands or wiſhes well to the Engliſh conſtitution. It is not an act of open violence done by the King, or any direct and palpable breach of the laws attempted by his miniſter, that can ever endanger the liberties of this country. Againſt ſuch a King or miniſter the people would immediately take the alarm, and all the parties unite to oppoſe him. The laws may be groſsly

violated in particular inſtances, without any direct attack upon the whole ſyſtem. Facts of that kind ſtand alone; they are attributed to neceſſity, not defended upon principle. We can never be really in danger, untill the forms of parliament are made uſe of to deſtroy the ſubſtance of our civil and political liberties;—until parliament itſelf betrays its truſt, by contributing to eſtabliſh new principles of government, and employing the very weapons committed to it by the collective body, to ſtab the conſtitution.

As for the terms of the remonſtrance, I preſume it will not be affirmed, by any perſon leſs poliſhed than a gentleman uſher, that this is a ſeaſon for compliments. Our gracious Sovereign indeed is abundantly civil to himſelf. Inſtead of an anſwer to a petition, his Majeſty very gracefully pronounces his own panegyric; and I confeſs, that, as far as his perſonal behaviour, or the royal purity of his intentions is concerned, the truth of thoſe declarations which the miniſter has drawn up for his maſter, cannot decently be diſputed. In every other reſpect, I affirm that they are abſolutely unſupported, either in argument or fact. I muſt add too, that ſupopſing the ſpeech were otherwiſe unexceptionable, it is not a direct anſwer to the petition of the city. His Majeſty is pleaſed to ſay, that he is always ready to receive the requeſts of his ſubjects; yet the ſheriffs were twice ſent back with an excuſe, and it was certainly debated in council whether or no the magiſtrates of the city of London ſhould be admitted to an audience. Whether the remonſtrance be or be not injurious to parliament, is the very queſtion between the

the parliament and the people, and ſuch a queſtion as cannot be decided by the aſſertion of a third party, however reſpectable. That the petitioning for a diſſolution of parliament is irreconcileable with the principles of the conſtitution is a new doctrine. His Majeſty perhaps has not been informed, that the houſe of commons themſelves have, by a formal reſolution, admitted it to be the right of the ſubject. His Majeſty proceeds to aſſure us that he has made the laws the rule of his conduct. Was it in ordering or permitting his miniſters to apprehend Mr. Wilkes by a general warrant?—Was it in ſuffering his miniſters to revive the obſolete maxim of *nullum tempus* to rob the Duke of Portland of his property and thereby give a deciſive turn to a county election?—Was it in erecting a chamber conſultation of ſurgeons, with authority to examine into and ſuperſede the legal verdict of a jury? Or did his Majeſty conſult the laws of his country, when he permitted his ſecretary of ſtate to declare, that whenever the civil magiſtrate is trifled with, a military force muſt be ſent for, *without the delay of a moment*, and effectually employed? Or was it in the barbarous exactneſs with which this illegal, inhuman doctrine was carried into execution?—If his Majeſty had recollected theſe facts, I think he would never have ſaid, at leaſt with any reference to the meaſures of his government, that he had made the laws the rule of his conduct. To talk of preſerving the affections or relying on the ſupport of his ſubjects, while he continues to act upon theſe principles, is indeed paying a compliment to their loyalty, which I hope they have too much ſpirit and underſtanding to deſerve.

His Majeſty, we are told, is not only punctual in the performance of his own duty, but careful not to aſſume any of thoſe powers which the conſtitution has placed in other hands. Admitting this laſt aſſertion to be ſtrictly true, it is no way to the purpoſe. The city of London have not deſired the King to aſſume a power placed in other hands. If they had, I ſhould hope to ſee the perſon, who dared to preſent ſuch a petition, immediately impeached. They ſolicit their Sovereign to exert that conſtitutional authority, which the laws have veſted in him for the benefit of his ſubjects. They call upon him to make uſe of his lawful prerogative in a caſe, which our laws evidently ſuppoſed might happen, ſince they have provided for it by truſting the Sovereign with a diſcretionary power to diſſolve the parliament. This requeſt will, I am confident, be ſupported by remonſtrances from all parts of the kingdom. His Majeſty will find at laſt, that this is the ſenſe of his people, and that it is not his intereſt to ſupport either miniſtry or parliament, at the hazard of a breach with the collective body of his ſubjects.—That he is the King of a free people, is indeed his greateſt glory. That he may long continue the King of a free people, is the ſecond wiſh that animates my heart. The firſt is, THAT THE PEOPLE MAY BE FREE.

JUNIUS.

LET-

LETTER XXXVI.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *April* 3, 1770.

IN my laſt letter I offered you my opinion of the truth and propriety of his Majeſty's anſwer to the city of London, conſidering it merely as the ſpeech of a miniſter, drawn up in his own defence, and delivered, as uſual, by the chief magiſtrate. I would ſeparate, as much as poſſible, the King's perſonal character and behaviour from the acts of the preſent government. I wiſh it to be underſtood that his Majeſty had in effect no more concern in the ſubſtance of what he ſaid, than Sir James Hodges had in the remonſtrance, and that as Sir James, in virtue of his office, was obliged to ſpeak the ſentiments of the people, his Majeſty might think himſelf bound by the ſame official obligation, to give a graceful utterance to the ſentiments of his miniſter. The cold formality of a well-repeated leſſon is widely diſtant from the animated expreſſion of the heart.

This diſtinction, however, is only true with reſpect to the meaſure itſelf. The conſequences of it reach beyond the miniſter, and materially affect his Majeſty's honour. In their own nature they are formidable enough to alarm a man of prudence, and diſgraceful enough to afflict a man of ſpirit. A ſubject, whoſe ſincere attachment to his Majeſty's perſon and family is founded upon rational principles, will not in the preſent conjuncture be ſcrupulous of alarm-

alarming, or even of afflicting his Sovereign. I know there is another ſort of loyalty, of which his Majeſty has had plentiful experience. When the loyalty of Tories, Jacobites, and Scotchmen, has once taken poſſeſſion of an unhappy prince, it ſeldom leaves him without accompliſhing his deſtruction. When the poiſon of their doctrines has tainted the natural benevolence of his diſpoſition, when their inſidious councils have corrupted the *ſtamina* of his government, what antidote can reſtore him to his political health and honour, but the firm ſincerity of his Engliſh ſubjects?

It has not been uſual in this country, at leaſt ſince the days of Charles the firſt, to ſee the Sovereign perſonally at variance, or engaged in a direct altercation with his ſubjects. Acts of grace and indulgence are wiſely appropriated to him, and ſhould conſtantly be performed by himſelf. He never ſhould appear but in an amiable light to his ſubjects. Even in France, as long as any ideas of a limited monarchy were thought worth preſerving, it was a maxim, that no man ſhould leave the royal preſence diſcontented. They have loſt or renounced the moderate principles of their government, and now, when their parliaments venture to remonſtrate, the tyrant comes forward, and anſwers abſolutely for himſelf. The ſpirit of their preſent conſtitution requires that the King ſhould be feared, and the principle, I believe, is tolerably ſupported by the fact. But, in our political ſyſtem, the theory is at variance with the practice, for the King ſhould be loved. Meaſures of greater ſeverity may, indeed, in ſome circumſtances, be neceſſary; but the miniſter who adviſes, ſhould take the execution and odium of them

them entirely upon himſelf. He not only betrays his maſter, but violates the ſpirit of the Engliſh conſtitution, when he expoſes the chief magiſtrate to the perſonal hatred or contempt of his ſubjects. When we ſpeak of the firmneſs of government, we mean an uniform ſyſtem of meaſures, deliberately adopted, and reſolutely maintained by the ſervants of the crown, not a peeviſh aſperity in the language or behaviour of the ſovereign. The government of a weak, irreſolute monarch may be wiſe, moderate, and firm;—that of an obſtinate, capricious prince, on the contrary, may be feeble, undetermined and relaxed. The reputation of public meaſures depends upon the miniſter, who is reſponſible, not upon the King, whoſe private opinions are not ſuppoſed to have any weight againſt the advice of his council, whoſe perſonal authority ſhould therefore never be interpoſed in public affairs.—This, I believe, is true conſtitutional doctrine. But for a moment let us ſuppoſe it falſe. Let it be taken for granted, that an occaſion may ariſe, in which a King of England ſhall be compelled to take upon himſelf the ungrateful office of rejecting the petitions, and cenſuring the conduct of his ſubjects; and let the city remonſtrance be ſuppoſed to have created ſo extraordinary an occaſion. On this principle, which I preſume no friend of adminiſtration will diſpute, let the wiſdom and ſpirit of the miniſtry be examined. They adviſe the King to hazard his dignity, by a poſitive declaration of his own ſentiments;—they ſuggeſt to him a language full of ſeverity and reproach. What follows? When his Majeſty had taken ſo deciſive a part in ſupport of his miniſtry and parliament, he had a right to expect from *them* a re-

a reciprocal demonſtration of firmneſs in their own cauſe, and of zeal for *his* honour. He had reaſon to expect (and ſuch, I doubt not were the bluſtering promiſes of Lord North) that the perſons, whom he had been adviſed to charge with having failed in their reſpect to him, with having injured parliament, and violated the principles of the conſtitution, ſhould not have been permitted to eſcape without ſome ſevere marks of the diſpleaſure and vengeance of parliament. As the matter ſtands, the miniſter, after placing his Sovereign in the moſt unfavourable light to his ſubjects, and after attempting to fix the ridicule and odium of his own precipitate meaſures upon the royal character, leaves him a ſolitary figure upon the ſcene, to recall, if he can, or to compenſate, by future compliances, for one unhappy demonſtration of ill-ſupported firmneſs, and ineffectual reſentment. As a man of ſpirit, his Majeſty cannot but be ſenſible, that the lofty terms in which he was perſuaded to reprimand the city, when united with the ſilly concluſion of the buſineſs, reſemble the pomp of a mock-tragedy, where the moſt pathetic ſentiments, and even the ſufferings of the hero are calculated for deriſion.

Such has been the boaſted firmneſs and conſiſtency of a miniſter, whoſe appearance in the houſe of commons was thought eſſential to the King's ſervice;—whoſe preſence was to influence every diviſion;—who had a voice to perſuade, an eye to penetrate, a geſture to command. The reputation of theſe great qualities has been fatal to his friends. The little dignity of Mr. Ellis has been omitted. The mine was ſunk;—combuſtibles provided, and

Wel-

Welbore Ellis, the Guy Faux of the fable, waited only for the ſignal of command. All of ſudden the country gentlemen diſcover how groſsly they have been deceived;—the miniſter's heart fails him, the grand plot is defeated in a moment, and poor Mr. Ellis and his motion taken into cuſtody. From the event of Friday laſt one would imagine, that ſome fatality hung over this gentleman. Whether he makes or ſuppreſſes a motion, he is equally ſure of his diſgrace. But the complexion of the times will ſuffer no man to be vice-treaſurer of Ireland with impunity.

I do not mean to expreſs the ſmalleſt anxiety for the miniſter's reputation. He acts ſeparately for himſelf, and the moſt ſhameful inconſiſtency may perhaps be no diſgrace to him. But when the Sovereign, who repreſents the majeſty of the ſtate, appears in perſon, his dignity ſhould be ſupported. The occaſion ſhould be important;—the plan well conſidered;—the execution ſteady and conſiſtent. My zeal for his Majeſty's real honour compels me to aſſert, that it has been too much the ſyſtem of the preſent reign, to introduce him perſonally, either to act for, or to defend his ſervants. They perſuade him to do what is properly *their* buſineſs, and deſert him in the midſt of it. Yet this is an inconvenience to which he muſt for ever be expoſed, while he adheres to a miniſtry divided among themſelves, or unequal in credit and ability to the great taſk they have undertaken. Inſtead of reſerving the interpoſition of the royal perſonage, as the laſt reſource of government, their weakneſs obliges them to apply it to every ordinary occaſion, and to render it cheap and common in the opinion of the people. Inſtead

of

of ſupporting their maſter, they look to *him* for ſupport, and for the emoluments of remaining one day more in office, care not how much his ſacred character is proſtituted and diſhonoured.

If I thought it poſſible for this paper to reach the cloſet, I would venture to appeal at once to his Majeſty's judgment. I would aſk him, but in the moſt reſpectful terms, 'As you are a young man, 'Sir, who ought to have a life of happineſs in proſ-'pect;—as you are a huſband;—as you are a father '[your filial duties I own have been religiouſly per-'formed] is it *bona fide* for your intereſt or your 'honour to ſacrifice your domeſtic tranquillity, and 'to live in a perpetual diſagreement with your peo-'ple, merely to preſerve ſuch a chain of beings as 'North, Barrington, Weymouth, Gower, Ellis, On-'ſlow, Rigby, Jerry Dyſon, and Sandwich? Their 'very names are a ſatire upon all governm-nt, and 'I defy the graveſt of your chaplains to read the 'catalogue without laughing.'

For my own part, Sir, I have always conſidered addreſſes from parliament as a faſhionable, unmeaning formality. Uſurpers, ideots, and tyrants have been ſucceſſively complimented with almoſt the ſame profeſſions of duty and affection. But let us ſuppoſe them to mean exactly what they profeſs. The conſequences deſerve to be conſidered. Either the ſovereign is a man of high ſpirit and dangerous ambition, ready to take advantage of the treachery of his parliament, ready to accept of the ſurrender they make him of the public liberty;—or he is a mild, undeſigning prince, who, provided they indulge him with a little ſtate and pageantry, would of himſelf intend no miſchief. On the firſt ſuppoſi-

tion

tion, it muſt ſoon be decided by the ſword, whether the conſtitution ſhould be loſt or preſerved. On the ſecond, a prince no way qualified for the execution of a great hazardous enterprize, and without any determined object in view, may nevertheleſs be driven into ſuch deſperate meaſures, as may lead directly to his ruin, or diſgrace himſelf by a ſhameful fluctuation between the extremes of violence at one moment, and timidity at another. The miniſter perhaps may have reaſon to be ſatisfied with the ſucceſs of the preſent hour, and with the profits of his employment. He is the tenant of the day, and has no intereſt in the inheritance. The ſovereign himſelf is bound by other obligations, and ought to look forward to a ſuperior, a permanent intereſt. His paternal tenderneſs ſhould remind him how many hoſtages he has given to ſociety. The ties of nature come powerfully in aid of oaths and proteſtations. The father, who conſiders his own precarious ſtate of health, and the poſſible hazard of a long minority, will wiſh to ſee the family eſtate free and unincumbered. What is the dignity of the crown, though it were really maintained;—what is the honour of parliament, ſuppoſing it could exiſt without any foundation of integrity and juſtice;—or what is the vain reputation of firmneſs, even if the ſchemes of the government were uniform and conſiſtent, compared with the heart-felt affections of the people, with the happineſs and ſecurity of the royal family, or even with the grateful acclamations of the populace. Whatever ſtile of contempt may be adopted by miniſters or parliaments, no man ſincerely deſpiſes the voice of the Engliſh nation. The houſe of commons are only interpreters, whoſe duty

it is to convey the ſenſe of the people faithfully to the crown. If the interpretation be falſe or imperfect, the conſtituent powers are called upon to deliver their own ſentiments. Their ſpeech is rude, but intelligible;—their geſtures fierce but full of explanation. Perplexed by ſophiſtries, their honeſt eloquence riſes into action. Their firſt appeal was to the integrity of theirrep reſentatives:—the ſecond to the King's juſtice;—the laſt argument of the people, whenever they have recourſe to it, will carry more perhaps than perſuaſion to parliament, or ſupplication to the throne.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXXVII.

ADDRESSED TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR, *May* 28, 1770.

WHILE parliament was ſitting, it would neither have been ſafe, nor perhaps quite regular, to offer any opinion to the public, upon the juſtice or wiſdom of their proceedings. To pronounce fairly upon their conduct, it was neceſſary to wait until we could conſider, in one view, the beginning, the progreſs, and the concluſion of their deliberations. The cauſe of the public was undertaken and ſupported by men, from whoſe abilities and united authority, to ſay nothing of the advantageous ground they ſtood on, might well be thought ſufficient to determine a popular queſtion in favour of the people. Neither was the houſe of commons ſo abſolutely

abſolutely engaged in defence of the miniſtry, or even of their own reſolutions, but that *they* might have paid ſome decent regard to the known diſpoſition of their conſtituents, and, without any diſhonour to their firmneſs, might have retracted an opinion too haſtily adopted, when they ſaw the alarm it had created, and how ſtrongly it was oppoſed by the general ſenſe of the nation. The miniſtry too would have conſulted their own immediate intereſt, in making ſome conceſſion ſatisfactory to the moderate part of the people. Without touching the fact, they might have conſented to guard againſt, or give up the dangerous principle, on which it was eſtabliſhed. In this ſtate of things, I think it was highly improbable at the beginning of the ſeſſion, that the complaints of the people upon a matter, which, in *their* apprehenſion at leaſt, immediately affected the life of the conſtitution, would be treated with as much contempt by their own repreſentatives, and by the houſe of lords, as they had been by the other branch of the legiſlature. Deſpairing of their integrity, we had a right to expect ſomething from their prudence, and ſomething from their fears. The duke of Grafton certainly did not foreſee to what an extent the corruption of a parliament might be carried. He thought, perhaps, that there was ſtill ſome portion of ſhame or virtue left in the majority of the houſe of commons, or that there was a line in public proſtitution, beyond which they would ſcruple to proceed. Had the young man been a little more practiſed in the world, or had he ventured to meaſure the characters of other men by his own, he would not have been ſo eaſily diſcouraged.

The prorogation of parliament naturally calls upon us to review their proceedings, and to conſider the condition in which they have left the kingdom. I do not queſtion but they have done what is uſually called the King's buſineſs much to his Majeſty's ſatisfaction. We have only to lament, that, in conſequence of a ſyſtem introduced or revived in the preſent reign, this kind of merit ſhould be very conſiſtent with the neglect of every duty they owe to the nation. The interval between the opening of the laſt, and the cloſe of the former ſeſſion was longer than uſual. Whatever were the views of the miniſter in deferring the meeting of parliament, ſufficient time was certainly given to every member of the houſe of commons, to look back upon the ſteps he had taken, and the conſequences they had produced. The zeal of party, the violence of perſonal animoſities, and the heat of contention had leiſure to ſubſide. From that period, whatever reſolution they took was deliberate and propenſe; in the preceding ſeſſion, the dependants of the miniſtry had affected to believe, that the final determination of the queſtion would have ſatisfied the nation, or at leaſt put a ſtop to their complaints; as if the certainty of an evil could diminiſh the ſenſe of it, or the nature of injuſtice could be altered by deciſion. But they found the people of England were in a temper very diſtant from ſubmiſſion; and altho' it was contended that the houſe of commons could not themſelves reverſe a reſolution, which had the force and effect of a judicial ſentence, there were other conſtitutional expedients, which would given a ſecurity againſt any ſimilar attempts for the future. The general propoſition,

poſition, in which the whole country had an intereſt, might have been reduced to a particular fact, in which Mr. Wilkes and Mr. Luttrell would alone have been concerned. The houſe of lords might interpoſe;—the King might diſſolve the parliament;—or, if every other reſource failed, there ſtill lay a grand conſtitutional writ of error, in behalf of the people, from the deciſion of one court to the wiſdom of the whole legiſlature. Every one of theſe remedies has been ſufficiently attempted. The people performed *their* part with dignity, ſpirit, and perſeverance. For many months his Majeſty heard nothing from his people but the language of complaint and reſentment;—unhappily for this country, it was the daily triumph of his courtiers that he heard it with an indifference approaching to contempt.

The houſe of commons having aſſumed a power unknown to the conſtitution, were determined not merely to ſupport it in the ſingle inſtance in queſtion, but to maintain the doctrine in its utmoſt extent, and to eſtabliſh the fact as a precedent in law, to be applied in whatever manner his Majeſty's ſervants ſhould hereafter think fit. Their proceedings upon this occaſion are a ſtrong proof that a deciſion, in the firſt inſtance illegal and unjuſt, can only be ſupported by a continuation of falſehood and injuſtice. To ſupport their former reſolutions, they were obliged to violate ſome of the beſt known and eſtabliſhed rules of the houſe. In one inſtance they went ſo far as to declare, in open defiance of truth and common ſenſe, that it was not the rule of the houſe to divide a complicated queſtion, at the re-

queſt of a member *. But after trampling upon the laws of the land, it was not wonderful that they ſhould treat the private regulations of their own aſſembly with equal diſregard. The ſpeaker, being young in office, began with pretending ignorance, and ended with deciding for the miniſtry. We were not ſurprized at the deciſion; but he heſitated and bluſhed at his own baſeneſs, and every man was aſtoniſhed.

The intereſt of the public was vigorouſly ſupported in the houſe of lords. Their right to defend the conſtitution againſt any incroachment of the other eſtates, and the neceſſity of exerting it at this period was urged to them with every argument that could be ſuppoſed to influence the heart or the underſtanding. But it ſoon appeared, that they had already taken their part, and were determined to ſupport the houſe of commons, not only at the expence of truth and decency, but even by a ſurrender of their own moſt important rights. Inſtead of performing that duty which the conſtitution expected from them, in return for the dignity and independence of their ſtation, in return for the hereditary ſhare it has given them in the legiſlature, the majority of them made a common cauſe with the other houſe in oppreſſing the people, and eſtabliſhed another doctrine as falſe in itſelf, and if poſſible more pernicious to the conſtitution, than that on which the Middleſex election was determined. By reſolving that they had

* This extravagant reſolution appears in the Votes of the Houſe: but, in the minutes of the committees, the inſtances of reſolutions contrary to law and truth, or of refuſals to acknowledge law and truth when propoſed to them, are innumerable.

had no right to impeach a judgment of the houſe of commons in any caſe whatſoever, where that houſe has a compleat juriſdiction, they in effect gave up the conſtitutional check and reciprocal controul of one branch of the legiſlature over the other, which is perhaps the greateſt and moſt important object provided for by the diviſion of the whole legiſlative power into three eſtates; and now, let the judicial deciſions of the houſe of commons be ever ſo extravagant, let their declarations of the law be ever ſo flagrantly falſe, arbitrary, and oppreſſive to the ſubject, the houſe of lords have impoſed a ſlaviſh ſilence upon themſelves;—they cannot interpoſe,—they cannot protect the ſubject,—they cannot defend the laws of their country. A conceſſion ſo extraordinary in itſelf, ſo contradictory to the principles of their own inſtitution, cannot but alarm the moſt unſuſpecting mind. We may well conclude, that the lords would hardly have yielded ſo much to the other houſe, without the certainty of a compenſation, which can only be made to them at the expence of the people. The arbitrary power they have aſſumed of impoſing fines and committing, during pleaſure, will now be exerciſed in its fulleſt extent. The houſe of commons are too much in their debt to queſtion or interrupt their proceedings. The crown too, we may be well aſſured, will loſe nothing in this new diſtribution of power. After declaring, that to petition for a diſſolution of parliament is irreconcileable with the principles of the conſtitution, his Majeſty has reaſon to expect that ſome extraordinary compliment will be returned to the Royal prerogative. The three branches of the legiſlature ſeem to treat their ſeparate rights and in-

tereſts

tereſts as the Roman Triumvirs did their friends. They reciprocally ſacrifice them to the animoſities of each other, and eſtabliſh a deteſtable union among themſelves, upon the ruin of the laws and liberty of the commonwealth.

Through the whole proceedings of the houſe of commons in this ſeſſion, there is an apparent, a palpable conſciouſneſs of guilt, which has prevented their daring to aſſert their own dignity, where it has been immediately and groſsly attacked. In the courſe of Doctor Muſgrave's examination, he ſaid every thing that can be conceived mortifying to individuals, or offenſive to the houſe. They voted his information frivolous, but they were awed by his firmneſs and integrity, and ſunk under it. The terms, in which the ſale of a patent to Mr. Hine were communicated to the public, naturally called for a parliamentary enquiry. The integrity of the houſe of commons was directly impeached; but they had not courage to move in their own vindication, becauſe the enquiry would have been fatal to Colonel Burgoyne, and the Duke of Grafton. When Sir George Saville branded them with the name of traitors to their conſtituents, when the Lord Mayor, the Sheriffs, and Mr. Trecothick, expreſsly avowed and maintained every part of the City Remonſtrance, why did they tamely ſubmit to be inſulted? Why did they not immediately expel thoſe refractory members? Conſcious of the motives on which they had acted, they prudently preferred infamy to danger, and were better prepared to meet the contempt, than to rouze the indignation of the whole people. Had they expelled thoſe five members, the conſequences of the new doctrine of incapacitation would have

have come immediately home to every man. The truth of it would then have been fairly tried without any reference to Mr. Wilkes's private character, or the dignity of the houſe, or the obſtinacy of one particular county. Theſe topics, I know, have had their weight with men, who, affecting a character of moderation, in reality conſult nothing but their own immediate eaſe;—who are weak enough to acquieſce under a flagrant violation of the laws when it does not directly touch themſelves, and care not what injuſtice is practiſed upon a man, whoſe moral character they piouſly think themſelves obliged to condemn. In any other circumſtances, the houſe of commons muſt have forfeited all their credit and dignity, if after ſuch a groſs provocation, they had permitted thoſe five gentlemen to ſit any longer among them. We ſhould then have ſeen and felt the operation of a precedent, which is repreſented to be perfectly barren and harmleſs. But there is a ſet of men in this country, whoſe underſtandings meaſure the violation of law, by the magnitude of the inſtance, not by the important conſequences, which flow directly from the principle, and the miniſter, I preſume, did not think it ſafe to quicken their apprehenſions too ſoon. Had Mr. Hampden reaſoned and acted like the moderate men of theſe days, inſtead of hazarding his whole fortune in a law-ſuit with the crown, he would have quietly paid the twenty ſhillings demanded of him,—the Stuart family would probably have continued upon the throne, and, at this moment, the impoſition of ſhip-money would have been an acknowledged prerogative of the crown.

What

What then has been the buſineſs of the ſeſſion, after voting the ſupplies, and confirming the determination of the Middleſex election? The extraordinary prorogation of the Iriſh parliament, and the juſt diſcontents of that kingdom, have been paſſed by without notice. Neither the general ſituation of our Colonies, nor that particular diſtreſs which forced the inhabitants of Boſton to take up arms in their defence, have been thought worthy of a moment's conſideration. In the repeal of thoſe acts, which were moſt offenſive to America, the parliament have done every thing, but remove the offence. They have relinquiſhed the revenue, but judiciouſly taken care to preſerve the contention. It is not pretended that the continuation of the tea duty is to produce any direct benefit whatſoever to the mother-country. What is it then but an odious, unprofitable exertion of a ſpeculative right, and fixing a badge of ſlavery upon the Americans, without ſervice to their maſters? But it has pleaſed God to give us a miniſtry and a parliament, who are neither to be perſuaded by argument, nor inſtructed by experience.

Lord North, I preſume, will not claim an extraordinary merit from any thing he has done this year in the improvement or application of the revenue. A great operation, directed to an important object, though it ſhould fail of ſucceſs, marks the genius and elevates the character of a miniſter. A poor contracted underſtanding deals in little ſchemes, which diſhonour him if they fail, and do him no credit when they ſucceed. Lord North had fortunately the means in his poſſeſſion of reducing all the four per cents at once. The failure of his firſt

enterprize

enterprize in finance is not half ſo diſgraceful to his reputation as a miniſter, as the enterprize itſelf is injurious to the public. Inſtead of ſtriking one deciſive blow, which would have cleared the market at once, upon terms proportioned to the price of the four per cents, ſix weeks ago, he has tampered with a pitiful portion of a commodity, which ought never to have been touched but in groſs;—he has given notice to the holders of that ſtock, of a deſign formed by government to prevail upon them to ſurrender it by degrees, conſequently has warned them to hold up and inhance the price;—ſo that the plan of reducing the four per cents muſt either be dropped entirely, or continued with an increaſing diſadvantage to the public. The miniſter's ſagacity has ſerved to raiſe the value of the thing he means to purchaſe, and to ſink that of the three per cents, which it is his purpoſe to ſell. In effect, he has contrived to make it the intereſt of the proprietor of four per cents to ſell out and buy three per cents in the market, rather than ſubſcribe his ſtock upon any terms, that can poſſibly be offered by government.

The ſtate of the nation leads us naturally to conſider the ſituation of the King. The prorogation of a parliament has the effect of a temporary diſſolution. The odium of meaſures adopted by the collective body ſits lightly upon the ſeparate members, who compoſed it. They retire into ſummer quarters, and reſt from the diſgraceful labours of the campaign. But as for the Sovereign, *it is not ſo with him*. He has a permanent exiſtence in this country; He cannot withdraw himſelf from the complaints, the diſcontents, the reproaches of his ſubjects. They purſue

purſue him to his retirement, and invade his domeſtic happineſs, when no addreſs can be obtained from an obſequious parliament to encourage or conſole him. In other times, the intereſt of the King and people of England was, as it ought to be, entirely the ſame. A new ſyſtem has not only been adopted in fact, but profeſſed upon principle. Miniſters are no longer the public ſervants of the ſtate, but the private domeſtics of the Sovereign. One particular claſs of men are permitted to call themſelves the king's friends, as if the body of the people were the King's enemies; or as if his Majeſty looked for a reſource or conſolation, in the attachment of a few favourites, againſt the general contempt and deteſtation of his ſubjects. Edward, and Richard the ſecond, made the ſame diſtinction between the collective body of the people, and a contemptible party who ſurrounded the throne. The event of their miſtaken conduct might have been a warning to their ſucceſſors. Yet the errors of thoſe Princes were not without excuſe. They had as many falſe friends, as our preſent gracious Sovereign, and infinitely greater temptations to ſeduce them. They were neither ſober, religious, nor demure. Intoxicated with pleaſure, they waſted their inheritance in purſuit of it. Their lives were like a rapid torrent, brilliant in proſpect, though uſeleſs or dangerous in its courſe. In the dull, unanimated exiſtence of other Princes, we ſee nothing but a ſickly, ſtagnant water, which taints the atmoſphere without fertilizing the ſoil.—The morality of a King is not to be meaſured by vulgar rules. His ſituation is ſingular. There are faults which do him honour, and virtues that diſgrace him. A faultleſs inſipid

equality

equality in his character, is neither capable of vice nor virtue in the extreme; but it ſecures his ſubmiſſion to thoſe perſons, whom he has been accuſtomed to reſpect, and makes him a dangerous inſtrument of *their* ambition. Secluded from the world, attached from his infancy to one ſet of perſons, and one ſet of ideas, he can neither open his heart to new connexions, nor his mind to better information. A character of this ſort is the ſoil fitteſt to produce that obſtinate bigotry in politics and religion, which begins with a meritorious ſacrifice of the underſtanding, and finally conducts the monarch and the martyr to the block.

At any other period, I doubt not, the ſcandalous diſorders, which have been introduced into the government of all the dependencies in the Empire would have rouſed and engaged the attention of the public. The odious abuſe and proſtitution of the prerogative at home,—the unconſtitutional employment of the military,—the arbitrary fines and commitments by the houſe of lords, and court of king's-bench;—the mercy of a chaſte and pious Prince extended chearfully to a wilful murderer, becauſe that murderer is the brother of a common proſtitute, would, I think, at any other time, have excited univerſal indignation. But the daring attack upon the conſtitution, in the Middleſex election, makes us callous and indifferent to inferior grievances. No man regards an eruption upon the ſurface, when the noble parts are invaded, and he feels a mortification approaching to his heart. The free election of our repreſentatives in parliament comprehends, becauſe it is, the ſource and ſecurity of every

right and privilege of the Engliſh nation. The miniſtry have realiſed the compendious ideas of Caligula. They know that the liberty, the laws, and property of an Engliſhman have in truth but one neck, and that to violate the freedom of election ſtrikes deeply at them all.

JUNIUS.

LETTER XXXVIII.

TO LORD NORTH.

MY LORD, *Aug.* 22, 1770.

MR. Luttrell's ſervices were the chief ſupport and ornament of the Duke of Grafton's adminiſtration. The honour of rewarding them was reſerved for your Lordſhip. The Duke, it ſeems, had contracted an obligation he was aſhamed to acknowledge, and unable to acquit. You, my Lord, had no ſcruples. You accepted of the ſucceſſion with all its incumbrances, and have paid Mr. Luttrell his legacy, at the hazard of ruining the eſtate.

When this accompliſhed youth declared himſelf the champion of government, the world was buſy in enquiring what honours or emoluments could be a ſufficient recompence, to a young man of his rank and fortune, for ſubmitting to mark his entrance into life with the univerſal contempt and deteſtation of his country. His noble father had not been ſo precipitate. To vacate his ſeat in parliament;—to intrude

trude upon a county in which he had no intereſt or connexion—to poſſeſs himſelf of another man's right, and to maintain it in defiance of public ſhame as well as juſtice, beſpoke a degree of zeal or depravity, which all the favour of a pious Prince could hardly requite. I proteſt, my Lord, there is in this young man's conduct, a ſtrain of proſtitution, which, for its ſingularity, I cannot but admire. He has diſcovered a new line in the human character;—he has degraded even the name of Luttrell, and gratified his father's moſt ſanguine expectations.

The Duke of Grafton, with every poſſible diſpoſition to patroniſe this kind of merit, was contented with pronouncing Colonel Luttrell's panegyric. The gallant ſpirit, the diſintereſted zeal of the young adventurer, were echoed through the houſe of Lords. His Grace repeatedly pledged himſelf to the houſe, as an evidence of the purity of his friend Mr. Luttrell's intentions;—that he had engaged without any proſpect of perſonal benefit, and that the idea of compenſation would mortally offend him. The noble Duke could hardly be in earneſt; but he had lately quitted his employment and began to think it neceſſary to take ſome care of his reputation. At that very moment the Iriſh negociation was probably begun.—Come forward, thou worthy repreſentative of Lord Bute, and tell this inſulted country, who adviſed the King to appoint Mr. Luttrell ADJUTANT-GENERAL to the army in Ireland. By what management was Colonel Cuninghame prevailed on to reſign his employment, and the obſequious Giſborne to accept of a

penſion for the government of Kinſale*? Was it an original ſtipulation with the Princeſs of Wales, or does he owe his preferment to your Lordſhip's partiality, or to the Duke of Bedford's friendſhip? My Lord, though it may not be poſſible to trace this meaſure to its ſource, we can follow the ſtream, and warn the country of its approaching deſtruction. The Engliſh nation muſt be rouſed, and put upon its guard. Mr. Luttrell has already ſhewn us how far he may be truſted, whenever an open attack is to be made upon the liberties of this country. I do not doubt that there is a deliberate plan formed.——Your Lordſhip beſt knows by whom;—the corruption of the legiſlative body on this ſide—a military force on the other—and then, *Farewell to England!* It is impoſſible that any miniſter ſhall dare to adviſe the King to place ſuch a man as Luttrell in the confidential poſt of Adjutant-General, if there

* This infamous tranſaction ought to be explained to the public. Colonel Giſborne was quarter-maſter-general in Ireland. Lord Townſhend perſuades him to reſign to a Scotch officer, one Fraſer, and gives him the government of Kinſale.—Colonel Cuninghame was Adjutant-General in Ireland. Lord Townſhend offers him a penſion, to induce him to reſign to Luttrell. Cuninghame treats the offer with contempt. What's to be done? poor Giſborne muſt move once more.—He accepts of a penſion of 500l. a year, until a government of greater value ſhall become vacant. Colonel Cuninghame is made Governor of Kinſale; and Luttrell, at laſt, for whom the whole machinery is put in motion, becomes Adjutant-General, and in effect takes the command of the army in Ireland.

there were not ſome ſecret purpoſe in view, which only ſuch a man as Luttrell is fit to promote. The inſult offered to the army in general is as groſs as the outrage intended to the people of England. What! Lieutenant-Colonel Luttrell Adjutant-General of any army of ſixteen thouſand men! one would think his Majeſty's campaigns at Blackheath and Wimbledon might have taught him better.—— I cannot help wiſhing General Hervey joy of a colleague, who does ſo much honour to the employment.—But, my Lord, this meaſure is too daring to paſs unnoticed, too dangerous to be received with indifference or ſubmiſſion. You ſhall not have time to new-model the Iriſh army. They will not ſubmit to be garbled by Colonel Luttrell. As a miſchief to the Engliſh conſtitution, (for he is not worth the name of enemy) they already deteſt him. As a boy, impudently thruſt over their heads, they will receive him with indignation and contempt.—As for you, my Lord, who perhaps are no more than the blind, unhappy inſtrument of Lord Bute and her Royal Highneſs the Princeſs of Wales, be aſſured that you ſhall be called upon to anſwer for the advice, which has been given, and either diſcover your accomplices, or fall a ſacrifice to their ſecurity.

JUNIUS.

THE END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

THE END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.